Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023

https://archive.org/details/monumentumancyra0000augu_l3r2

P. DeLong Mrs Geo C Lindsay
624 Oakland
Webster Groves.
Mo.

THE
MONUMENTUM
ANCYRANUM

Oxford University Press
London Edinburgh Glasgow Copenhagen
New York Toronto Melbourne Cape Town
Bombay Calcutta Madras Shanghai
Humphrey Milford Publisher to the UNIVERSITY

THE MONUMENTUM ANCYRANUM

EDITED BY

E. G. HARDY
Principal of Jesus College, Oxford

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
1923

Printed in England

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
PORTLAND, OR 97211

PREFACE

THIS edition of the *Monumentum Ancyranum*, prepared some years ago but hung up by the war, pretends to be no more than a text-book for the Schools. It was originally put together for the use of my own pupils, and no English edition of the *Res Gestae* had so far existed. My principal aim has been to substantiate, amplify, or modify the statements of Augustus by references to the ancient authorities, and I have therefore in all important matters cited these authorities in full. I have of course been indebted at every turn to Mommsen's exhaustive Latin commentary, though in matters admitting of doubt or controversy I have exercised my own independent judgement. As far as the text is concerned, I have been content almost without exception to follow Mommsen's edition of the *Res Gestae* published in 1883. I have not thought it necessary (though I would have done it if I could) to distinguish by square brackets his supplements and conjectures from the certain text. I have also followed his arrangement of taking the statements one by one, the Greek version under the Latin, adding an English translation, and appending my commentary to each. I have thought that this arrangement, together with a full table of contents by chapters prepared by my wife, would enable the text to be read continuously and with little interruption, without printing the whole document consecutively in parallel columns.

I must express my deep obligation to Mr. P. E. Matheson for twice reading over the proofs and making many valuable suggestions, and to Mr. C. E. Laurence for verifying and correcting my references throughout, a service rendered all the more necessary by the fact that my MSS. had passed through a Braille stage. I have to thank the Secretary of the Clarendon

Press for his courtesy and assistance, and his staff for the extraordinary correctness of the proofs. Mr. J. C. Haire has again given me invaluable assistance both in preparing the notes and in correcting the proofs.

As this is likely to be my last public appearance in print, I take the opportunity of thanking the small circle of friends and fellow-workers in the field of Roman History for their kind and appreciative reception of the series of articles and monographs, which I must apologize for having in a way forced upon their attention by means of off-prints. They have claimed to be nothing more than re-interpretations of familiar evidence, but they have had to do duty for any more ambitious schemes that I may ever have cherished, and they contain whatever of interest or value circumstances have allowed me to contribute to the history of the later Republic and the early Empire. I should have liked, and I have sometimes been urged, to republish these articles, or a selection of them, in a collected form, so as to make them more accessible to students of the period. It is, however, difficult to convince publishers that such a venture would appeal to a sufficiently numerous public, and I dare say that their hesitation is justified. I am therefore, as the only other means of saving my articles from complete oblivion, venturing to append a list of them at the end of this volume, with indications where they may be found by any students who may wish to refer to them. I should have liked my last published work to have contained more of originality and value than the present little book can claim, but I hope that, however imperfectly, it may be found to fill a gap and to prove of some assistance to men who are reading for Literae Humaniores.

E. G. H.

Jesus College, Oxford.
25th January, 1923.

2896

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction. p. 7.

Description of the Monument as an account of the res gestae. p. 25.

Cap. I. p. 26.

Raising of an army against Antony in 44 B.C.; admission to and place in senate; conferment of imperium; association with consuls in S.C. ultimum; election as consul and triumvir.

Cap II. p. 30.

Special tribunal to try liberators; their double defeat at Philippi.

Cap. III. p. 32.

Wars throughout empire; clemency to citizens, and, where possible, to foreign races; number of citizens who took the military oath; how many settled in colonies or sent to their municipia; land or money given to all; number of captured ships.

Cap. IV. p. 37.

Number of ovations and triumphs; of salutations as imperator; triumphs refused; laurel wreaths deposited in Capitol; number of supplications decreed; on how many days; kings led in triumph; number of consulships and years of tribunician power.

Cap. V. p. 43.

Dictatorship refused in 22 B.C.; acceptance of cura annonae; its successful working; annual consulship refused.

Cap. VI. p. 46.

Office of cura legum morumque offered by senate in 19, 18, and 11 B.C., but refused; (Latin version lost) colleague in trib. pot. five times asked for.

Cap. VII. p. 50.

Member of triumvirate for ten years; princeps senatus for forty years; sacerdotal offices.

Cap. VIII. p. 52.

Increase of patrician families; lectio senatus three times; census and lustrum with Agrippa in 30 B.C.; second census in 8 B.C.; third lustrum with Tiberius in A.D. 13; new laws passed on social matters.

Cap. IX. p. 61.

Vows for health of Augustus every six years; private and municipal sacrifices for same object.

Cap. X. p. 63.

Name inserted in Carmen Saliare; tribunician power for life conferred by law; post of pontifex maximus, refused at first, accepted in 12 B.C.

Cap. XI. p. 66.
Altar to Fortuna Redux erected after return from Syria; Augustalia instituted.

Cap. XII. p. 68.
Escort of senators sent to meet Augustus in Campania; altar to Pax Augusta erected in Campus Martius after return from Spain.

Cap. XIII. p. 71.
The temple of Janus closed three times.

Cap. XIV. p. 72.
Honours decreed to Gaius and Lucius Caesar.

Cap. XV. p. 76.
Gifts to plebs in 44 and 29 B. C.; congiarium in 24 B. C.; corn gratuities in 23 B. C.; gift to plebs in 12 B. C.; gift to 320,000 in 5 B. C.; gratuity to 120,000 Italian colonists in 29 B. C.; gift to 200,000 people in 2 B. C.

Cap. XVI. p. 81.
Money paid to municipia in 30 and 14 B. C. for lands granted to soldiers in Italy and the provinces; grants of money between 7 and 2 B. C. to soldiers sent back to their municipia.

Cap. XVII. p. 86.
Aerarium Saturni assisted four times; aerarium militare established in 6 A. D.

Cap. XVIII. p. 89.
Corn quotas and money tribute made up for provincial possessores.

Cap. XIX. p. 91.
Temples and other buildings constructed in Rome.

Cap. XX. p. 94.
Two temples restored; aqueducts repaired or improved; Forum Iulium completed and basilica completed and rebuilt after fire. Via Flaminia restored and bridges repaired between Rome and Ariminum in 27 B. C.

Cap. XXI. p. 98.
Building of temple to Mars Ultor and Forum Augusti; gifts from spoils of war consecrated in several temples; aurum coronarium remitted to Italian cities in 29 B. C. and afterwards.

Cap. XXII. p. 101.
Number of gladiatorial shows; of athletic contests; number of games exhibited; Ludi Saeculares in 17 B. C.; institution of Ludi Martiales; exhibitions of wild beasts.

Cap. XXIII. p. 107.
Naval battle exhibited across the Tiber.

Cap. XXIV. p. 108.
Ornaments carried off by Antony restored to temples of Asia; statues of himself transformed into gifts for temples.

Cap. XXV. p. 110.
Victory over pirates (Sex. Pompeius) and restoration of slave soldiers to their masters; military oath taken to Octavian by Italy and the Western provinces; number of senators serving in his army.

Cap. XXVI. p. 114.
Frontiers of provinces extended; peace restored to Gaul. Spain and Germany; Alpine region pacified from Hadriatic to Tuscan sea; fleet dispatched from Rhine to country of Cimbri, several tribes seeking friendship; account of expeditions sent to Ethiopia and Arabia Felix.

Cap. XXVII. p 125.
Egypt added to the empire; treatment of Greater Armenia; missions of Tiberius and Gaius Caesar; eastern provinces recovered after Actium.

Cap. XXVIII. p. 133.
Provinces in which military colonies were established; twenty-eight colonies in Italy.

Cap. XXIX. p. 137.
Military standards recovered from Spain, Gaul, and Dalmatia; standards of three Roman armies recovered from Parthia.

Cap. XXX. p. 139.
Pannonian tribes conquered by Tiberius, and empire pushed to Danube; Dacians conquered on both sides of the Danube.

Cap. XXXI. p. 143.
Embassies from Indian kings; friendship of Rome sought by Bastarnae, Scythians, Sarmatae, Albani, Iberi, and Medi.

Cap. XXXII. p. 145.
List of suppliant kings; sons and grandsons of Phraates sent to Rome; other races, once hostile, seek friendship of Rome.

Cap. XXIII. p. 149.
Kings from Rome accepted by Parthians and Medes.

Cap. XXXIV. p. 151.
Statement as to restoration of the Republic; title of Augustus and other honours; position of pre-eminent dignity but equality of power.

Cap. XXXV. p. 161.
Title of pater patriae in 2 B.C.; this record written at age of seventy-six.

Appendix I. p. 163.

Appendix II. p. 164.

Appendix III. p. 165.

Appendix IV. p. 166.

List of Articles since 1908 on points of Roman History. p. 167.

INTRODUCTION

The so-called Monumentum Ancyranum is perhaps the most interesting and important inscription that has ever come to light. Its unique interest lies in the fact that it gives us in his own words what is almost the dying statement of the founder of the Roman Principate. Its importance speaks for itself if it is in any degree what it professes to be, a record *rerum gestarum divi Augusti quibus orbem terrarum imperio populi Romani subiecit.*

According to Suetonius the record (*index rerum a se gestarum*) was one of three documents which Augustus had drawn up and which before his last journey to Campania he had deposited with the Vestal Virgins. The other two documents were his somewhat elaborate testament with directions on a variety of matters, and what Suetonius calls a *breviarium imperii*, containing financial and other statistics. All three were to be read aloud in the senate after his death, and the record of his achievements was to be engraved on two bronze tablets, outside his mausoleum in the Campus Martius. These directions must have been carried out by Tiberius. It is not unlikely that the Monument was read in the senate at the first meeting held after the old emperor's death, and I feel no doubt that the appreciations and depreciations alluded to by Tacitus in *Ann.* 1. 9, 10 represented the discussions and observations called forth by the dead emperor's record of his own early career, which had just been publicly recited. Of the inscribed record affixed to the mausoleum, and thus, as it were, presenting posterity with a funeral oration spoken by the deceased himself, no trace has yet been discovered, but the words in the rubric of the Monument at Ancyra *aheneis piiis*

quae sunt Romae positae prove that the wishes of Augustus were carried out.

It is remarkable that this evidence and with it the full text of this famous document should come from one of the most outlying regions of the empire. The Monument was found engraved, and still exists *in situ*, on the walls of a temple at Ancyra (Angora) in Galatia, other inscriptions proving that the temple was the Σεβαστεῖον or temple of Rome and Augustus. The inscription is contained on six compartments or pages, the first three being engraved on the wall of the πρόναος to the left of the entrance, the last three on the wall to the right. On the wall of what was originally the *cella* of the temple is the Greek version, arranged in twenty columns or pages all continuously side by side. Curiously enough there are indications that a second copy of the document was set up in Galatia, since four fragments of the Greek version have been found on the walls of what was evidently the Σεβαστεῖον at Apollonia in Pisidia.

At the time when the last sentence was written, only the two copies of the Monumentum at Ancyra and Apollonia were known to exist. In 1914, however, Sir William Ramsay discovered a number of limestone fragments containing scraps of the Latin version of the Monument at Antioch in Pisidia, the Colonia Caesarea. The fragments were found on and about the remains of a wide staircase, probably erected as a monument to the memory of Augustus, the founder of the colony, connecting the lower part of the city with the Augusta Platea, its most prominent *vicus*, at one extremity of which stood a small temple of Augustus. The Monument may probably have been inscribed on the walls right and left of this staircase. The fragments, only about thirty-five in number, are, with one or two exceptions, very short, and come from all parts of the Monument except the first seven paragraphs. They are of little importance for the text, as they correspond with the Ancyran copy, but they confirm several of Mommsen's restora-

tions. Sir W. Ramsay believes that the Appendix may have been longer than that at Ancyra, and perhaps included the explanatory preface of our Monument. So far, no traces have been found of a Greek version, and, as Antioch was distinctively a Roman military colony, it may well have been considered unnecessary to add one.[1]

It is not necessary here to enlarge upon the policy of Augustus in establishing the imperial cult celebrated in temples dedicated in the provinces to Rome and Augustus. Dio (51. 20), after recording the institution of the two original temples at Pergamum and Nicomedia, distinctly states that the example was followed in the other provinces. How many of these provincial temples to Rome and Augustus were already in existence before the death of Augustus is uncertain, but in the East at any rate we may be fairly sure that each province had its own Σεβαστεῖον, and, as the institution especially appealed to the Oriental mind, in many cases more than one. After the death of Augustus, Tiberius, as we have seen, caused this document to be engraved and set up publicly in Rome, and it seems a legitimate inference to suppose that, perhaps still acting in accordance with the wishes of Augustus, he took measures to bring this notable record of distinction and achievement before the notice of the provincials. This could hardly be done more appropriately or more effectually than by having it engraved in the various temples of Rome and Augustus. If in Rome the appropriate place for the dead emperor's recital of his own achievements was his mausoleum, in the provinces certainly no sites could be selected where this recital would be more impressive or more convincing than

[1] Sir W. Ramsay gives the text of all the fragments and a full account of the discovery in *J. R. S.* vol. vi, pp. 105 29. He looks forward to the discovery of many other fragments, when excavations are able to be resumed, while the Appendix, if recovered, may throw light on the circumstances under which the Monument was set up, whether in accordance with instructions of Augustus, or a decree of the colony, or as an act of loyalty on the part of an individual.

the temples where the deified Augustus shared the veneration of the provincials with the goddess of the imperial city. Nor were there any centres where more provincials were likely to see and read the inscriptions, since the periodical religious festival and games would always attract multitudes of worshippers and sight-seers. It therefore seems probable that Tiberius caused copies of the document to be engraved on the walls of all temples of Rome and Augustus existing at the time of his accession, and that in the Greek-speaking parts of the empire he had a Greek translation appended. That the two copies known to have existed come from the province of Galatia is no doubt due to the very remoteness of that country, where ancient monuments have a greater chance of escaping destruction than in cities lying more directly in the stream of historic changes and more exposed to vicissitudes of fortune. But the remoteness of central Asia Minor, which has preserved almost intact this priceless inscription, has made the process of completely recovering its contents a long and chequered one. It was not till after the Renaissance that any knowledge of its existence reached the West, and the first attempt of scholars to obtain a copy was made in 1555, when under the auspices of the Emperor Ferdinand II an embassy of scholars directed by a Dutchman named Buysbecche reached Angora and brought back the *exemplum Busbequianum*. But the work of copying the six columns was entrusted to different members of the party, and only pages iii and iv were completely copied, mere fragments of the remaining four being deciphered. Of the Greek translation no investigation was made, nor was it apparently realized that the Greek inscription on other walls of the building (supposed to be the *praetorium*) had any connexion with the Latin Monument.

With this imperfect and tantalizing copy, which, however, presented many opportunities for conjecture and emendation, scholars had to be content till 1689, when a merchant of Smyrna named Cosson secured by means not ascertained

another copy (*exemplum Cossonianum*) which, though filling up some of the gaps left by the earlier copy, was still imperfect and unsatisfactory.

In 1701 a mission was sent out to Angora under the auspices of Louis XIV, directed by a French scholar named de Tournefort. A third copy (*exemplum Tournefortianum*) was thus secured, an improvement on its predecessors, and in particular filling some conspicuous gaps in pages ii and v, but the general result was in some respects disappointing, and there is some suspicion that many of the emendations to the *exemplum Cossonianum* were due to conjecture rather than to verification from the engraving on the stone.

A much more successful expedition to the site of the Monument was made four years later (1705) by another Frenchman, Paul Lucas, who for the first time made a complete and careful copy of all the six columns of the Latin inscription, though he had to report, as de Tournefort had done, that the Greek inscription was virtually inaccessible.

This copy of the Monument, on which European scholars based their editions and commentaries for nearly 150 years, was not only a great advance on all earlier copies, but is still of value as representing the inscription at a time when the letters on the stone were often in a better state of preservation than when more scientifically procured copies were obtained Meanwhile a possible means of establishing doubtful places in the Latin text was supplied by successive instalments of the Greek version, especially those copied by Pocock in 1745 and Hamilton in 1836. But the fact that private houses were built up against the wall of the *cella* of the temple was so far an insurmountable obstacle to further progress in this direction.

In 1859 Mordtmann of Hamburg went to Angora, intending to find some means of uncovering the Greek inscription and of getting a facsimile of the Latin. He was unsuccessful in both these aims, but he brought back an emended copy of the

Latin version (*exemplum Mordtmannianum*), which, in Mommsen's opinion, is vitiated by the fact that Zumpt's conjectural emendations are too often read into the stone.

In 1861, under the auspices of Napoleon III, two eminent French scholars, Georges Perrot and Edmond Guillaume, made a successful expedition to Angora and brought back a new and corrected copy of the Latin inscription, and of all the accessible portions of the Greek. It was on this copy that Mommsen based his first edition of the *Res Gestae* in 1865, and it is mainly on the work of these scholars that the text of the inscription is founded as it appears in vol. iii of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* published in 1863.

The final step towards recovering the complete and authentic text of the Monument was taken in 1882, when Humann, equipped by the Academy of Berlin, succeeded in getting casts in plaster of Paris not only of the whole of the Latin, but now for the first time of the entire Greek inscription. It was now possible for scholars in Europe to compare doubtful readings in the earlier copies with what was virtually the evidence of the Monument itself, the latter not seldom being elucidated by the former in places where the engraving had become less decipherable through lapse of time. The Greek text too was often valuable, sometimes in filling lacunae (as in the famous passage on the *cura legum morumque*) more often in supplying or verifying doubtful numerals. Mommsen was not slow in taking advantage of the new material, and his second edition was published in 1883. I have been content throughout to adopt his text without question or remark. The Greek translation, apart from the few places already referred to, where it fills gaps or determines numerals, is of little value for the interpretation of the Monument. Mommsen and Kaibel show conclusively that the translator was a Roman and not a Greek. Out of the numerous indications of this it is enough to cite the following. No Greek would have used such Latin constructions as ὁμολογούντων ἵνα χειροτονηθῶ for

consentientibus ut . . .; νόμῳ ἐκυρώθη ἵνα ἱερὸς ὦ for *sacrosanctus ut essem lege sanctum est*; τῷ παντὶ αἰῶνι δὶς μόνον for *bis omnino*; ἐκ μείζονος μέρους for *magna ex parte*; ἃ μοι συνέστη (which cost me) for *quae mihi constiterunt*. Such renderings again as ἀποτίμησις συνεκλείσθη (cf. *condere lustrum*) for *lustrum feci*, and εὐχὰς ἀναλαμβάνειν for *vota suscipere* point to greater familiarity with Latin than Greek idioms. I am only concerned with the point because it may indicate that the translation was made at Rome and not in the provinces, a supposition almost necessary if we accept the view that the Monument was set up in all the Greek-speaking provinces. The fact that slight mistranslations sometimes occur, such as καταβεβλημένα ἔργα for *coepta profligataque opera*, where the technical sense of *profligata* is not rendered, or ἐκ συναρχίας τῶν τεσσάρων ἱερέων for *sacerdotum quattuor amplissima collegia*, or διὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἀρχῶν ἐν μέρει for *aliorum magistratuum vicem* (cf. Gk. 7. 22 with IV. 13; Gk. 5. 12 with II. 17; Gk. 12. 8 with IV. 35) is no doubt a little surprising in an officially prepared version. On the other hand, such a substitution as that of ὁμοθυμαδόν for *per omnia pulvinaria*, and the rendering of *corona civica* as ὁ δρύινος στέφανος ὁ διδόμενος ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τῶν πολιτῶν, may well be official adaptations of obscure or unfamiliar terms, while the substitution of κατὰ τὰς εὐχὰς τῶν ἐμῶν πολιτῶν for *per universorum consensum* makes me suspect the hand of Augustus himself, who may have thought the phrase more impressive to Greek ears. It has already been noticed that the fragments found at Apollonia belong to the same version as that of Ancyra. Of the four extant portions at the top of columns ii, iii, iv, and v of the inscription as arranged at Apollonia, the first starts with 3. 12, the second with 6. 5, the third with 8. 17, and the fourth with 11. 10 of the Ancyran copy. The fragments are in *C. I. Gr.* iii. 3971.

The Contents of the Monument.

Suetonius, as we have seen, describes the document as *index rerum a se gestarum*. This is not incorrect, for in the widest sense of *res gestae* almost every statement, certainly those relating to public expenditure, may be appropriately brought under this head. It is possible, however, to introduce some classification of the contents, and the headings of the Latin and Greek inscriptions at Ancyra divide the subject-matter into two categories. The Greek makes them πράξεις καὶ δωρεαί, and this again is not incorrect, though πράξεις admits of further classification, and δωρεαί requires limitation to public objects. The Latin heading makes the division *res gestae quibus orbem terrarum imperio populi Romani subiecit* and *inpensae quas in rempublicam fecit*. This is obviously a defective classification, leaving undescribed a considerable part of the contents, especially the statements in *caps.* 1 to 3 (I. 1–20).

For this Mommsen substitutes a triple classification; (1) a statement of the various honours, titles, and offices received by Augustus; *caps.* 1–14; (2) a statement of money spent on public objects; *caps.* 15–24; (3) an account of wars, conquests, and expeditions; *caps.* 25 to the end.

Of these the Latin inscription omits the first and inverts the order of the two last. It cannot be said that this is a very satisfactory division, since the contents of *caps.* 1–14 are quite inadequately summarized by Mommsen's language.

To do the record justice, we shall require a fourfold classification, each division falling under *res gestae* in their wide connotation.

(1) *Caps.* 1–3 (I. 1–20) give a brief summary of the *res gestae,* domestic and military, between 44 and 28 B.C. These statements comprise the first raising of an army in 44 B.C., admission to the senate at the beginning of 43 B.C. as an acknowledgement of his services; the grant of *imperium* and

his association with the consuls in defending the state. Then comes the election to the consulship and the appointment as *triumvir*, followed by a reference to the judicial proceedings against Caesar's murderers and to their final defeat at the double battle of Philippi. We then have a general statement as to the successful termination of the civil wars by land and sea, the pardon extended to citizens, and the leniency shown, where possible, to foreign races. The section ends (except for a statement of the number of ships captured in the civil wars) with an important statistical record of the number of citizens recruited for the legions between 31 B.C. and A.D. 14 and of the provision made for three-fifths of them by grants of land or gifts of money. It is clear that the honorary decrees, the consulship, and the position of *triumvir* are inserted not for their own sake, but as specifying the authority under which the *res gestae* were performed.

(2) *Caps.* 4–14 (I. 21–III. 6). This is the section which most nearly answers to Mommsen's 'list of honours, titles, and offices', but an analysis will show the superficiality of such a description. As a matter of fact, it is difficult to sum up the contents of this section of the document by any single formula, since they are essentially heterogeneous, but the following divisions will give a fair idea of their character.

(*a*) *Res gestae* within the sphere of domestic administration and government. Under this would be included: 1. the acceptance of the *cura annonae* in 22 B.C. and the successful work performed in that year (I. 32–5); 2. the legislation carried out at the instance of the senate by virtue of the *tribunicia potestas*, the statement being made in connexion with the thrice repeated refusal of the *cura legum morumque* (Gk. 3. 11–21); 3. a further and more explicit account of the general object of the social legislation (II. 12–14); 4. increase of patrician families (II. 1); 5. the holding of a *lectio senatus* on three occasions (II. 1–2); 6. the completion of a census on three occasions (II. 2–11).

(*b*) Statements positive or negative as to his constitutional position: 1. Office of *triumvir* held for ten years (Gk. 4. 1–2); 2. number of consulships and years of *tribunicia potestas* (I. 28–30); 3. appointment as *pontifex maximus* (II. 23–8); 4. enrolment as *princeps senatus* (I. 44–5); 5. grant of *tribunicia potestas* for life (II. 21–2); 6. appointment of colleague in *tribunicia potestas* sanctioned five times by the senate (Gk. 3. 21–3); 7. refusal of dictatorship in 22 B.C. (I. 31–2); 8. refusal of perpetual consulship (I. 36–7).

(*c*) Public acts or functions marking successful *res gestae*: 1. Ovations, triumphs, and salutations as *imperator* (I. 21–2); 2. laurelled *fasces* deposited in the Capitol (I. 22–4); 3. the temple of Janus thrice closed (II. 42–5); 4. number of *supplicationes* decreed by senate, and number of days devoted to them (I. 24–7).

(*d*) Honours of a more personal kind: 1. Vows for his safety decreed by the senate and performed by sacerdotal colleges (II. 15–18); 2. sacrifices for his health by individuals or towns (II. 18–20); 3. insertion of his name in *carmen Saliare* (II. 21); 4. membership in chief sacerdotal colleges (I. 45–6); 5. consecration of altar to Fortuna Redux on his return from Syria in 19 B.C. (II. 29–33); 6. deputation to meet him in Campania (II. 34–6); 7. altar to Pax consecrated on his return from Gaul and Spain (II. 37–41). As the consecration of these two altars was undoubtedly to celebrate important *res gestae* in the East and West, they might have been placed in the previous class.

The concluding statement in this section, that about the position and honours granted to the two young Caesars, contains a personal note (*quos mihi eripuit Fortuna*), and is perhaps as due to family pride as the boast that he led nine kings in his triumphs is to personal vanity.

(3) If the second division of the Monument is heterogeneous in character, the third is comparatively simple and comprises what may be summed up as *impensae in rempublicam*. At

the same time, the nature of these disbursements varies considerably. Large sums, not specified, were spent on works of permanent public utility such as the construction or repair of temples, *fora*, *basilicae*, aqueducts, roads, &c. Of the six hundred million *denarii* mentioned in the summary at the end of the Monument considerably more than half was expended on an object of imperial importance, the settlement of discharged soldiers on Italian or provincial land, or money pensions to those sent back to their *municipia*. For the rest, the greater part of the expenditure was devoted to the population of the capital, either in direct gratuities to all members of the *plebs urbana*, or extra corn allowances, or to the amusement of the public by means of gladiatorial and other shows, the amount of these latter expenses not being stated. In a few cases the money was spent on Italian municipalities, whether military colonies recently founded, or the colonies and *municipia* which were liable for *aurum coronarium*. Only in two instances is any expenditure in the provinces recorded, in connexion with occasional relief to the occupiers of public land in the payment of their *vectigalia*, and with the replacement of property belonging to the temples of Asia which had been seized by Antony.

(4) The fourth section roughly corresponds with the *res gestae quibus orbem terrarum imperio populi Romani subiecit*, containing statements as to wars, expeditions by land and sea, extensions of the frontier, annexations, and diplomatic relations with foreign kings. But it must be noted that interspersed among this context there are certain statements which apparently would have found a more natural place in the first division of the document, since, like all the statements in *caps.* 1–3, they relate to the period terminated by the formal establishment of the Principate in 28 and 27 B.C. I allude especially to V. 1–9, where reference is made, though without the mention of his name, to the defeat of Sex. Pompeius and the consequent clearing of the seas from piracy, to the military

oath taken in Octavius' name by Italy and the Western provinces at the outbreak of war with Antony, and to the number of senators and consulars serving in his armies. Quite as unrelated to the other contents of this section, and as appropriate to form the conclusion of the first, is the memorable passage (VI. 13–23) in which Augustus declares that he restored the republic, and records the titles and honours decreed at that time by the grateful senate.

After these preliminary remarks on the arrangement and classification of the contents of the Monument, it will be convenient to give a continuous conspectus of them.

I.

44 B. C.	1–3.	raising of an army *privato consilio et privata impensa* at the age of nineteen;
43 B. C.	3–5.	admission to the senate by honorary decree with consular place in debate; grant of *imperium*;
43 B. C.	6 7.	association with the consuls in *S. c. ultimum* to defend the republic;
43 B. C.	7–9.	created consul on the death of Hirtius and Pansa, and later in the same year a *IIIvir reipublicae constituendae*;
43 B. C.	10–13.	outlawry by judicial action against Caesar's murderers, and their double defeat at Philippi;
42 B. C.	13–15.	Augustus records his successful conclusion of civil and other wars by land and sea, his clemency towards citizens, and his reluctance to exterminate foreign races;
30 B. C.	16–19.	of 500,000 citizens who served in his armies,
14 B. C.		three-fifths settled on land in colonies or
7 seq. B. C.		sent to their homes with pensions;
	19–20.	number of ships captured;
	21–22.	two ovations, three triumphs, twenty-one imperial salutations

22–24. other triumphs declined; laurelled *fasces* deposited in the Capitol in fulfilment of vows;

24–26. number of *supplicationes* decreed in his honour by the senate;

26–27. total number of days on which *supplicationes* were held;

27–28. number of kings and princes led in triumph;

28–30. number of consulships held and years of tribunician power at the date of writing;

19 B. C. 31–32. the dictatorship refused when offered by people and senate in his absence and in Rome;

22 B. C. 32–35. the *cura annonae* accepted in a time of scarcity, and prompt relief afforded to the people;

19 B. C. 35–36. the perpetual and annual consulship refused;

19 B. C. Gk. 3. 11–21. the *cura legum morumque* offered
18 B. C. three times by senate and people refused as
11 B. C. contrary to *mos maiorum* and the requisite reforms accomplished by the tribunician power;

18, 13, 6 B. C. Gk. 3. 22–23. a colleague in the tribunician
A. D. 4, 13. power five times allowed by the senate;

43–33 B. C. Gk. 4. 1–2. the position of *IIIvir* held for ten consecutive years;

29 B. C.–14 A. D. 44–45. the position of *princeps senatus* held for forty years;

45–46. membership recorded in the chief sacerdotal colleges;

II.

29 B. C. 1–2. number of patrician families increased;

29, 18 B. C., 3 A. D. 1–2. a *lectio senatus* held three times;

29 B. C. 2–5. *census* and *lustrum* completed as *cos.* V with Agrippa;

8 B. C. 5–8. second census taken alone *consulari cum imperio*;

13 A. D. 8–11. third census taken with Tiberius *consulari cum imperio*;

18 B. C. 12–14. restoration of many habits and customs by means of new laws and introduction of worthy precedents by his own example;

15–18. vows for his safety offered up by the senate and performed by the priests of the sacerdotal colleges;

18–20. sacrifices *pro valetudine mea* performed by individuals and municipalities;

21. his name inserted in the *carmen Saliare*;

36 B. C. 21–23. laws passed by which he was declared to be

30 B. C. *sacrosanctus* and by which he received the tribunician power for life;

12 B. C. 23–28. the office of *pontifex maximus* refused at first, but on the death of the holder, accepted;

19 B. C. 29–33. an altar consecrated by the senate to Fortuna Redux to celebrate his return from Syria, and anniversary sacrifices established;

34–36. a deputation of magistrates and nobles sent out to meet him in Campania;

15 B. C. 37–39. an altar to Pax Iulia consecrated by the senate on his return from Gaul and Spain, and annual sacrifices established;

42–45. the temple of Ianus closed three times as a sign of general peace;

5 B. C. 46–III. 6. Gaius and Lucius Caesar, each at the age

2 B. C. of fourteen, designated consuls, allowed to be present in the senate, and proclaimed *principes iuventutis* by the equestrian order;

III.

44 B. C. 7–8. 75,000 $\overline{\text{HS}}$. distributed to the plebs in accordance with Caesar's testament;

29 B. C. 8–9. 100,000 $\overline{\text{HS}}$. distributed to the plebs from the spoils of war in his fifth consulship;

24 B. C. 9–11. 100 million $\overline{\text{HS}}$. given to the plebs as a *congiarium* in his tenth consulship;

23 B. C. 11–12. a quantity of corn purchased at his own expense in his eleventh consulship for extra distributions to the plebs;

12 B. C. 12–15. 100 million $\overline{\text{HS}}$. divided among the plebs in his eighteenth tribunician year;

5 B. C. 15–17. 76,800,000 $\overline{\text{HS}}$. divided among the plebs in his twelfth consulship;

29 B. C. 17–19. 120 million $\overline{\text{HS}}$. distributed in his fifth consulship to recent military colonies in Italy;

2 B. C. 19–21. 48 million $\overline{\text{HS}}$. divided among the plebs in his thirteenth consulship;

30 B. C. 14 B. C. 22–28. statement as to the amount of money (600 million $\overline{\text{HS}}$. and 260 million $\overline{\text{HS}}$.) paid respectively for land in Italy and the provinces for discharged soldiers, and declaration that no previous founder of military colonies had paid for the land;

2 B. C. 28–33. money provided in specified years for discharged soldiers sent back to their domiciles;

34–35. the *aerarium Saturni* subsidized four times with 150 million $\overline{\text{HS}}$.

6 A. D. 35–39. the *aerarium militare* endowed with 170 million $\overline{\text{HS}}$. from the *patrimonium* for pensions to discharged soldiers;

12 B. C. seq. 40–43. assistance rendered from his own land or from the *patrimonium* to provincial *possessores* in years of difficulty;

IV.

1–8. statement as to the erection of many temples and some other public buildings;

9–10. restoration of Capitoline temple and theatre of Pompey;

9–10. repair of dilapidated channels in aqueducts;

11–12. a second channel added to the *aqua Marcia*;

12–16. the *Forum Iulium* and *basilica Iulia* completed or to be completed by his heirs;

27 B.C. 17–18. orders given in his seventh consulship for the restoration of eighty-two temples;

19–20. the *via Flaminia* repaired from Rome to Ariminum;

21–22. the temple of Mars Ultor and the *Forum Augustum* built out of the spoils of war;

22–23. theatre of Marcellus built;

23–26. gifts consecrated in various temples to the value of 100 million HS.;

29 B.C. 26–30. *aurum coronarium* to the value of 35,000 pounds remitted to colonies and *municipia* on occasion of his triumphs, and on each salutation as *imperator*;

31–33. gladiatorial shows given in his own name or that of members of his family;

33–35. exhibitions of athletes;

35–36. games given in his own name, and many times for other magistrates;

17 B.C. 36–37. games given in 17 B.C. in association with Agrippa as *magister* of the *XVviri*;

2 B.C. 38–39. *ludi Martiales* founded in 2 B.C. and celebrated afterwards by the consuls;

39–42. number of *venationes* given and wild beasts exhibited;

43–48. exhibition of naval battle on site beyond the Tiber afterwards occupied by the *nemus Caesarum*;

49–51. gifts carried off from the temples of Asia by his enemy restored after Actium;

51–54. statues of himself converted into offerings for the temple of Apollo on the Palatine;

V.

36 B. C. 1–6. the sea cleared of pirates; fugitive slaves in arms against the state handed over to their masters;

31 B. C. 3–6. Italy and the Western provinces take the oath of allegiance to him, and demand his leadership in the war ending at Actium;

6–8. number of senators and consulars who served under his standard;

9–10. the frontiers of all provinces extended where the tribes were hostile;

10–12. Spain, Gaul, and Germany, from Gades to the Elbe, brought under the Roman peace;

12–14. the Alpine country from the Hadriatic to the Tuscan sea brought into subjection without harshness to the tribes;

14–19. expedition of the fleet from the Rhine to the borders of the Cimbri, and envoys received from remote German tribes;

29 seq. B. C. 18–23. two expeditions undertaken, one to Arabia Felix, the other into Ethiopia;

30 B. C. 24. Egypt added to the empire;

20 B. C. 24–33. statement of policy with regard to Armenia;

1 B. C. Tigranes made king by Tiberius; Ariobarzanes by Gaius Caesar;

33–34. recovery of all provinces beyond the Hadriatic, which had been lost to the empire and handed over to kings, and of Sicily and Sardinia;

35–36. enumeration of provinces in which military colonies were established;

36–38. establishment of twenty-eight populous and flourishing colonies in Italy;

39–40. recovery of standards lost in Spain, Gaul, and Dalmatia;

20 B.C. 40–43. the king of Parthia compelled to restore the captured standards of three Roman armies;

12 seq. B.C. 44–49. remote Pannonian tribes conquered by Tiberius, the frontier pushed forward to the Danube; the Dacians twice defeated, once south of the Danube, once beyond it;

50–51. embassies received from kings in India;

51–53. the friendship of Rome sought by envoys from Bastarnae, Scythians, Sarmatae, Albani, and Hiberi;

54–VI. 3. kings received as suppliants from Parthians, Medes, Adiabeni, Britanni, Sugambri, Marcomanni, and Suebi;

VI.

3–6. the king of Parthia sends his sons to Rome;

6–8. many other races experience the friendship of Rome;

9–12. names of kings sent out from Rome at the request of Parthians and Medes;

27 B.C. 6–13. in sixth and seventh consulships the republic relinquished to senate and people; the title of Augustus conferred and the *corona civica*; description of his position as compared with other magistrates;

2 B.C. 24–27. the title of *pater patriae* conferred and inscribed in the *Forum Augustum*;

28. the record written at the age of seventy-six.

29–43. Summary statement of the expenditure on gratuities to the people and discharged soldiers, building and restoration of public works, exhibitions and shows, and liberality towards Italian and provincial cities.

THE MONVMENTVM ANCYRANVM

Rerum gestarum divi Augusti quibus orbem terrarum imperio populi Romani subiecit, et inpensarum quas in rem publicam populumque Romanum fecit, incisarum in duabus aheneis pilis quae sunt Romae positae, exemplar subiectum.

Μεθηρμηνευμέναι ὑπεγράφησαν πράξεις τε καὶ δωρεαὶ Σεβαστοῦ θεοῦ ἃς ἀπέλιπεν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης ἐνκεχαραγμένας χαλκαῖς στήλαις δυσί.

Subjoined is a copy of the record made of the exploits of the deified Augustus by which he brought the whole world under the empire of the Roman people, and of the sums of money expended by him on the Republic and people of Rome. The original record is engraved on two brazen pillars set up in Rome.

Both Suetonius and Dio Cassius state that Augustus left behind him three important documents, his testament, a *breviarium imperii*, and the record of which a copy has been preserved at Ancyra. As to the last, Suetonius (*Aug.* 101) speaks of *indicem rerum a se gestarum quem vellet incidi in aheneis tabulis quae ante mausoleum statuerentur.* Dio (56. 33) speaks of the document as containing τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἔπραξε πάντα, ἃ καὶ ἐς χαλκᾶς στήλας πρὸς τῷ ἡρῴῳ αὑτοῦ σταθείσας ἀναγραφῆναι ἐκέλευσε. There is no reason to suppose that the index, as set up in Rome by Tiberius, was bilingual.

CAP. I

I. 1–3. *Annos undeviginti natus exercitum privato consilio et privata impensa comparavi per quem rem publicam dominatione factionis oppressam in libertatem vindicavi.*

1. 1–4. *Ἐτῶν δεκαεννέα ὢν τὸ στράτευμα ἐμῇ γνώμῃ καὶ ἐμοῖς ἀναλώμασιν ἡτοίμασα, δι' οὗ τὰ κοινὰ πράγματα ἐκ τῆς τῶν συνομοσαμένων δουλήας ἠλευθέρωσα.*

At the age of nineteen years, on my own authority and at my own cost, I raised the army by means of which I liberated the republic from the oppression of a tyrannical faction.

Octavian was born 23 Sept. in 63 B.C. He had reached Rome from Apollonia in the summer of 44, and it was at the beginning of November that he raised the nucleus of an army. We get the facts from Appian, *B.C.* 3. 40. When Antony had gone to Brundisium to meet his legions from Macedonia, *δείσας ὁ Καῖσαρ μὴ μετὰ τῆς στρατιᾶς ἐπανελθὼν ἀφρούρητον αὐτὸν λάβοι, χρήματα φέρων ἐς Καμπανίαν ᾖει, πείσων τὰς πόλεις οἳ στρατεύεσθαι, τὰς ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ᾠκισμένας. Καὶ ἔπεισε Καλατίαν πρώτην, ἐπὶ δ' ἐκείνῃ Κασιλῖνον, δύο τάσδε Καπύης ἑκατέρωθεν. Ἐπιδοὺς δ' ἑκάστῳ δραχμὰς πεντακοσίας ἦγεν ἐς μυρίους ἄνδρας, οὔτε ὡπλισμένους ἐντελῶς οὔτε συντεταγμένους πω κατ' ἴλας, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐς μόνην τοῦ σώματος φυλακήν.* Not long after, Octavian was joined by *legio Martia* and *legio IV*, two of Antony's four legions (App. *B.C.* 3. 45). There is a similar account in Velleius (2. 61) whose phrases, *oppressa dominatione Antoni civitas, . . . undevicesimum annum ingressus* (this makes him a year too young), and *privato consilio*, suggest that he may have used the Monument. He makes it clear, however, that the men drawn from Calatia and Casilinum were *veterani paterni*, and emphasizes the absence of all other support against Antony. The last point is naturally brought out by Cicero.

Early in November he writes: *Kalendis vesperi litterae mihi ab Octaviano. Magna molitur. Veteranos qui sunt Casilini et Calatiae perduxit ad suam sententiam. Nec mirum; quingenos denarios dat. Cogitat reliquas colonias obire. Plane hoc spectat ut se duce bellum geratur cum Antonio* (*ad Att.* 16. 8. 1). Again, in the third *Philippic* (2. 1) delivered in December, he declares: *C. Caesar adulescens, paene potius puer, incredibili ac divina quadam mente atque virtute, cum maxime furor arderet Antoni cumque eius a Brundisio crudelis et pestifer reditus timeretur, nec postulantibus nec cogitantibus ne optantibus . . . quidem nobis, . . . firmissimum exercitum ex invicto genere veteranorum militum comparavit patrimoniumque suum effudit.*

On the other hand, the detractors of Augustus could talk of *cupidine dominandi concitos per largitionem veteranos, paratum ab adulescente privato exercitum, corruptas consulis legiones, simulatam Pompeianarum gratiam partium* (Tac. *Ann.* 1. 10).

The Greek version shows that *exercitum* means not 'an army', but 'the army', which Octavian retained till the victory at Actium made him *libertatis populi Romani vindex* (Eckh. 6. 83). Augustus would never have spoken of the result of Antony's defeat at Mutina as a vindication of liberty. The *factio* must be the party of the liberators, and not, as Velleius understood it, the following of Antony.

I. 3–5. *Ob quae senatus decretis honorificis in ordinem suum me adlegit C. Pansa L. Hirtio consulibus, consularem locum simul dans sententiae ferendae, et imperium mihi dedit.*

1. 4–7. *Ἐφ' οἷς ἡ σύνκλητος ἐπαινέσασά με ψηφίσμασι προσκατέλεξε τῇ βουλῇ, Γαΐῳ Πάνσᾳ Αὔλῳ Ἱρτίῳ ὑπάτοις, ἐν τῇ τάξει τῶν ὑπατικῶν ἅμα τὸ συμβουλεύειν δοῦσα, ῥάβδους τ' ἐμοὶ ἔδωκεν.*

On account of which the senate with laudatory decrees made me a member of its order in the consulship of

C. Pansa and A. Hirtius, giving me at the same time the right to vote among the consulars, and granted me a (propraetorian) imperium.

On 1 Jan. 43 B. C. Hirtius and Pansa entered on the consulship, and, as they recognized the authority of the senate, the republic was in a sense restored. But Cicero chose this moment to carry into effect a measure wholly inconsistent with the republican constitution. Octavian had for the past two months been virtually the armed ally of the government, but Cicero now caused him to be put in an official position without any of the legal qualifications. It appears that the first step, possibly taken before 1 Jan. 43 (Velleius, ii. 61, has *consulibus designatis*), was to recognize his command of the army he had raised by the title of *pro praetore*. Livy's epitomator says: *C. Caesari, qui primus reipublicae arma sumpserat, propraetoris imperium a senatu datum est cum consularibus ornamentis; adiectumque est ut senator esset* (*Epit.* 118). Cicero made his proposal in the fifth Philippic, and it describes Octavian as already *pro praetore*. Thus *ita censeo decernendum: quod C. Caesar, C. filius, pontifex, pro praetore, summo rei publicae tempore milites veteranos ad libertatem p. R. cohortatus sit, . . . senatui placere C. Caesarem, C. filium, pontificem, pro praetore, senatorem esse sententiamque loco praetorio dicere: eiusque rationem, quemcunque magistratum petet, ita haberi, ut haberi per leges liceret, si anno superiore quaestor fuisset* (*Phil.* 5. 17. 46). According to Dio Cassius (46. 29) Octavian was granted τὸ βουλεύειν ἐν τοῖς τεταμιευκόσι, and the right of seeking the other magistracies ten years before the legal period. Putting these statements together, we may assume that two decrees were passed: (1) admitting him to the senate, his position being *inter quaestorios* in regard to his *cursus honorum*, but with the praetorian status in debate; and (2) giving him the *consularia ornamenta*, and this was interpreted as modifying part of the former decree, and carrying

with it the consular place in voting. Octavian represents a third grant as having been made at this time, viz. that of the *imperium*. This is confirmed by the epitomator, but it seems possible that the grant was taken as involved in the terms of the *senatus consultum ultimum*. At any rate the *imperium* was conferred on 7 Jan. 43 B. C., as is proved by the *Lex Arae Narbonensis* (*C. I. L.* xii. 4333): *VII quoque Idus Ianuar. qua die primum imperium orbis terrarum auspicatus est.* Cf. also *C. I. L.* x. 8375 *VII Idus Ianuar. eo die Caesar primum fasces sumpsit.*

I. 6–7. *Res publica ne quid detrimenti caperet me pro praetore simul cum consulibus providere iussit.*

1. 8–10. *Περὶ τὰ δημόσια πράγματα μή τι βλαβῇ, ἐμοὶ μετὰ τῶν ὑπάτων προνοεῖν ἐπέτρεψεν ἀντὶ στρατηγοῦ . . .*

It ordered me as propractor in concert with the consuls to take measures that the republic should suffer no detriment.

That the *senatus consultum ultimum* was passed is explicitly stated only by Augustus. Dio Cassius, however, implies it (46. 29): *ταραχήν τε εἶναι ἐψηφίσαντο, καὶ τὴν ἐσθῆτα τὴν βουλευτικὴν ἀπεδύσαντο, τόν τε πόλεμον τὸν πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ τοῖς ὑπάτοις καὶ τῷ Καίσαρι, στρατηγοῦ τινα ἀρχὴν δόντες, προσέταξαν.* Appian merely describes the decree as *τοῖς ὑπάτοις Ἱρτίῳ καὶ Πάνσᾳ Καίσαρα συστρατηγεῖν οὗ νῦν ἔχει στρατοῦ* (*B. C.* 3. 51). The last decree was of course in accordance with republican precedent, and ushered in a state of domestic war, though Antony was not yet declared a public enemy. The *imperium*, which by courtesy at least was already recognized, was now confirmed by the association with the consuls in the last decree, and, as the Greek version shows, by the actual concession of the *fasces*.

I. 7–9. *Populus autem eodem anno me consulem, cum consul uterque bello cecidisset, et trium virum rei publicae constituendae creavit.*

1. 10–14. Ὁ δὲ δῆμος τῷ αὐτῷ ἐνιαυτῷ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν ὑπάτων πολέμῳ πεπτωκότων, ἐμὲ ὕπατον ἀπέδειξεν, καὶ τὴν τῶν τριῶν ἀνδρῶν ἔχοντα ἀρχὴν ἐπὶ τῇ καταστάσει τῶν δημοσίων πραγμάτων εἵλατο.

In the same year, when both consuls had fallen in the war, the people created me consul, and chose me one of the triumvirs for the settlement of the republic.

Technically, no doubt, it was the people which elected Octavian consul, but how the *comitia* were held in the absence of consuls is not stated, and the decision was really that of the senate, Octavian choosing his own colleague, Q. Pedius. Velleius (2. 65) says that he was made consul on 22 Sept., the day before his twentieth birthday. He was really elected on 19 Aug. (Dio Cass. 56. 30; Tac. *Ann.* 1. 9; Dess. 108). The circumstances are given by Appian *B. C.* 3. 94–5. The consulship was resigned before the triumvirate was established. This was the result of a tribunician law introduced by P. Titius. καὶ δήμαρχος Πόπλιος Τίτιος ἐνομοθέτει καινὴν ἀρχὴν ἐπὶ καταστάσει τῶν παρόντων ἐς πενταετὲς εἶναι τριῶν ἀνδρῶν . . . ἴσον ἰσχύουσαν ὑπάτοις (App. *B. C.* 4. 7). The office commenced on 27 Nov. 43, and was to terminate on 31 Dec. 38 (*ab a. d. V Kal. Dec. ad pridie Kal. Ian. sextas*). Cf. Liv. *Epit.* 119; Suet. *Aug.* 10; Vell. 2. 69.

CAP. II

I. 10–12. *Qui parentem meum interfecerunt, eos in exilium expuli, iudiciis legitimis ultus eorum facinus, et postea bellum inferentis rei publicae vici bis acie.*

1. 15–18. Τοὺς τὸν πατέρα μου καταφονεύσαντας ἐξ-ώρισα κρίσεσιν ἐνδίκοις τειμωρησάμενος αὐτῶν τὸ ἀσέβημα,

καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα αὐτοὺς πόλεμον ἐπιφέροντας τῇ πατρίδι δὶς ἐνείκησα παρατάξει.

The murderers of my father I drove into exile, avenging their crime through courts lawfully constituted; and when afterwards they waged war against the republic, I twice conquered them on the battle-field.

In order to summarize his action towards the 'liberators', Augustus departs from the chronological course of events, comprising in this statement things which happened before and after the establishment of the triumvirate.

Octavian had professed to accept Cicero's amnesty of 18 March 44, by the terms of which no inquiry was to be made into Caesar's death. His first act, on becoming consul, was to declare his real policy of revenge by causing the *lex Pedia* to be passed. The facts appear in the statements of Velleius and the epitomator. The former (2. 69) says: *at lege Pedia, quam consul Pedius collega Caesaris tulerat, omnibus qui Caesarem patrem interfecerant, aqua ignique damnatis interdictum erat.* The latter (*Epit.* 120) says: *Caesar consul legem tulit de quaestione habenda in eos, quorum opera pater occisus esset; postulatique ea lege M. Brutus, C. Cassius, D. Brutus absentes damnati sunt.* Cf. Suet. *Aug.* 10 and App. *B. C.* 3. 95. An extraordinary *quaestio* or *iudicium* was set up by the *lex Pedia*, analogous to those for the trials of Clodius and Milo. The liberators were accused one by one before this court, and as they failed to appear, were condemned, the sentence being *aquae et ignis interdictio.* The position of the condemned was that of those *qui solum verterant*, but, as they had not become citizens of some other state, they were not technically *exsules.* For the double defeat of Brutus and Cassius at Philippi, see Suet. *Aug.* 13 *Philippense quoque bellum, quamquam invalidus atque aeger, duplici proelio transegit, quorum priore castris exutus vix ad Antoni cornu fuga evaserat.* The part played by Antony in retrieving the first and winning the second battle is characteristically ignored.

CAP III

I. 13–15. *Bella terra et mari civilia externaque toto in orbe terrarum suscepi, victorque omnibus superstitibus civibus peperci. Externas gentes quibus tuto ignosci potuit, conservare quam excidere malui.*

1. 19–23. Πολέμους καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλασσαν ἐμφυλίους καὶ ἐξωτικοὺς ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ πολλοὺς ἀνεδεξάμην, νεικήσας τε πάντων ἐφεισάμην τῶν περιόντων πολειτῶν. τὰ ἔθνη, οἷς ἀσφαλὲς ἦν συνγνώμην ἔχειν, ἔσωσα μᾶλλον ἢ ἐξέκοψα.

I undertook wars throughout the whole world by land and by sea against citizens and against foreigners, and to all citizens who survived I showed mercy. Foreign races too, where pardon was without danger, I preferred to conserve rather than to extirpate.

This is a vague and comprehensive statement, especially in regard to the *externa bella*. To these the words *toto in orbe terrarum* seem to refer, while *terra et mari* refer to the civil wars. In speaking of his clemency towards citizens, Augustus is alluding to the victories at Philippi and Actium, more especially to the latter. He is giving the official version of his conduct, a version repeated, as we should expect to find, in Velleius 2. 86 *victoria vero fuit clementissima, nec quisquam interemptus est paucissimis exceptis, qui ne deprecari quidem pro se sustinerent.* Coins also prove that Octavian was honoured by a *corona querna civica civibus servateis* (see below vi. 18 f.). The clemency was perhaps more relative than positive. At any rate Dio Cassius (51. 2) is indiscreet enough to say: τῶν τε βουλευτῶν καὶ τῶν ἱππέων τῶν τε ἄλλων τῶν κορυφαίων τῶν συμπραξάντων τι τῷ Ἀντωνίῳ πολλοὺς μὲν χρήμασιν ἐζημίωσε, πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ ἐφόνευσε, καί τινων καὶ ἐφείσατο. As to the wars with *externae gentes*, Augustus may be alluding especially (*a*) to the campaigns in Dalmatia between 36 and 33 B.C., (*b*) to the

wars in North Italy against such tribes as the Salassi, Camunni, and Trumpelini, and many other Celtic and Ligurian peoples, (*c*) to the expedition of Licinius Crassus from Macedonia in 29 B. C. against the Moesian and Dacian tribes south of the Danube, and (*d*) to the constant wars against the Cantabri in North-West Spain. The extermination of the Salassi in 25 B. C. and the treatment of the numerous tribes recorded by Augustus himself as having been warred down (Dio Cass. 53. 25; Strab. 4. 6. 7; Suet. *Aug.* 21) show that to those races *quibus tuto ignosci potuit*, there were many exceptions. Otherwise, these conquered races were either recruited for the auxiliary service and so drained of their youth, or 'attributed' to neighbouring towns, as the Trumpelini were to Brixia, or the Camunni to Bergomum.

I. 16–19. *Millia civium Romanorum adacta sacramento meo fuerunt circiter quingenta. Ex quibus deduxi in colonias aut remisi in municipia sua stipendis emeritis millia aliquantum plura quam trecenta et iis omnibus agros a me emptos aut pecuniam pro praediis a me dedi.*

1. 23, 2. 1–4. Μυριάδες Ῥωμαίων στρατεύσασαι ὑπὸ τὸν ὅρκον τὸν ἐμὸν ἐγένοντο ἐνγὺς πεντήκοντα. Ἐξ ὧν κατήγαγον εἰς τὰς ἀποικίας ἢ ἀπέπεμψα εἰς τὰς ἰδίας πόλεις ἐκλυομένας μυριάδας πολλῷ πλείους ἢ τριάκοντα, καὶ πάσαις αὐταῖς ἢ ἀγροὺς ἐμέρισα ἢ χρήματα τῆς στρατείας δωρεὰν ἔδωκα.

About five hundred thousand Roman citizens were bound to me by the military oath. Of these, after the due expiry of their service, I settled in colonies or sent back to their own municipia somewhat more than three hundred thousand, and to all of them I gave lands purchased by myself, or in lieu of lands sums of money provided by myself.

With regard to the 500,000 men who took the military oath to Augustus, and the 300,000 whom he discharged, Mommsen suggests that the balance of 200,000 may be represented

(*a*) by the 150,000 contained at the time of his death in the twenty-five legions specified in *Ann.* 4. 5, and (*b*) by 50,000 killed, deceased, or cashiered. This seems to me to leave many questions unsolved, and in particular to make the number of those who were killed or died in service far too small, especially when we remember that 18,000 were lost at one blow with Varus in A. D. 10.

But who are included under the 500,000? Mommsen excludes, and certainly with justice, all those legions which may have transferred themselves to Octavian from Lepidus or from Antony after Actium. But we must as definitely exclude all those soldiers who, having taken the military oath to Octavian, were provided for by the Italian land settlement after Philippi, since no lands were bought at that time. It seems to me that we must start from the state of things immediately before, or more probably immediately after Actium. The legions then under the command of Octavian at the end of 31 B.C. formed the first contribution towards the total of 500,000. Of this legionary force Octavian retained a portion and discharged a portion. With regard to the former I adhere to the conclusion reached many years ago (*Studies in Roman History*, 1st Series, pp. 162–79), that he retained twenty-two legions or 132,000 men. That in 30 B.C. he settled a large number of his soldiers as colonists on Italian lands, he tells us himself, and we know it from Dio Cassius and Hyginus to be cited on III. 22–8. Among the largesses of the year 29 B.C. *acceperunt id triumphale congiarium in coloniis hominum circiter centum et viginti millia* (*infr.* III. 19). As it is generally admitted that these were the military colonists of the preceding year, we have accounted for 252,000 of the *quingenta millia*. It appears therefore that 248,000 were recruited for the legions during the forty-four years between 30 B.C. and A. D. 14, of whom 150,000 were serving at the latter date. Of the 248,000 we must keep apart 36,000, as representing the six fresh legions (XVII, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI, and XXII) created between A. D. 6 and 10 during the Pannonian war, and after the catastrophe of

Varus.[1] Taking the forty-four years, and reckoning the number of legions as twenty-two,[2] we get 220 as the average annual number of recruits for each legion. The number would of course vary much both in particular years and for particular legions; e. g. there would be many more in 14 B.C., when many military colonies were established in the provinces, and in the years specified by Augustus (III. 29) when *honesta missio* was freely granted. On the other side of the balance it is clear that all the 500,000, with the exception of the 150,000 actually serving in A.D. 14, had been discharged, or had been killed or had died in service since 31 B.C. As Augustus declares that *trecenta millia* had been discharged and rewarded by himself, only 50,000 are left as the total of those who had been killed or had died in service during the forty-four years. This may seem a small number, especially as 18,000 were lost under Varus in A.D. 10. But it must be remembered that, with the exceptions of the campaigns of Drusus and Tiberius in Germany and the Pannonian rebellion, there was little more than desultory frontier fighting, and that the burden of this fell very largely on the auxiliary forces. As regards the

[1] The hypothesis that the six legions mentioned above (XVII to XXII) were created between A.D. 6 and 10, has been rendered to a certain extent doubtful by fresh evidence from the Berlin papyri to which my attention has been drawn.

It appears from these papyri (*a*) that reference is made to two soldiers of *legio XXII* in the year 8 B.C., and (*b*) that in a contract at Alexandria dated 5 B.C. another soldier belonging to the same legion is mentioned. Obviously if *legio XXII* was already in existence at these dates, the other five legions must have been so too. I allow my text to stand, and merely note the point, which has come to my knowledge only as the MS. is going to press. If further evidence in the same direction comes to light, it may be necessary to assume that while many fresh recruits had to be raised for these legions subsequent to the Pannonian war—and for this at least there is ample evidence—the legions themselves were not created at this time. The reference to the Berlin papyri is *Aegyptische Urkunden aus den königlichen Museen zu Berlin*, B. G. U. IV. 1104, 1109[3], and 1108.

[2] There were, of course, twenty-five for the last four or five years, but, as there was a strong tendency to postpone the *honesta missio*, the number of recruits may not have appreciably increased.

300,000 discharged by Augustus, we shall get further details in III. 22 ff. below. They are here simply divided into those who were settled in colonies and those sent back to their own *municipia*. With this distinction corresponds that between those who received lands and those who received money in lieu of lands. We shall see below, what is not indicated here, that the colonization was at two dates, in 30 B. C. on Italian land, and in 14 B. C. on provincial land. On the other hand, the return of discharged soldiers to their own *municipia* with a money allowance took place in a series of years from 7 B. C. and marked a change of policy. In the phrases *agros a me emptos* and *pecuniam a me dedi* it is not necessary to discuss whether *fiscus* or *patrimonium* is referred to. On each occasion Augustus made use of money of which he had the sole control. In 30 B. C. he was *omnium rerum potitus*, and therefore financially supreme; in 14 B. C. he had the revenues of the Tres Galliae and Tarraconensis at his disposal, whether they belonged to a central *fiscus* or not; in 7 B. C. and the following years he probably paid the allowances for discharged soldiers out of his *patrimonium*, as we know that he did in A. D. 6, when he founded the *aerarium militare* (III. 35–6). With the phrase *a me dedi* conf. *a se dividebat*, in Suet. *Aug.* 40.

I. 19–20. *Naves cepi sescentas praeter eas, si quae minores quam triremes fuerunt.*

2. 7–8. *Ναῦς δὲ . . . εἷλον ἑξακοσίας πλὴν τούτων, εἴ τινες ἥσσοντες ἐγένοντο ἢ τριήρεις.*

Of ships I captured six hundred in addition to those of smaller build than triremes.

Three hundred ships were taken at Actium (Plut. *Anton.* 68) and afterwards formed part of the fleet stationed at Forum Iuli in Narbonensis. Mommsen cites Appian, *B. C.* 5. 108 and 118–121, from which it appears that Sex. Pompeius lost to Octavian thirty ships at Mylae and over 290 at Naulochus. Augustus rarely underestimates, so that perhaps a few of these were smaller than triremes.

CAP. IV

I. 21. *Bis ovans triumphavi, tris egi curulis triumphos.*

2. 9. Δὶς ἐπὶ κέλητος ἐθριάμβευσα, τρὶς ἐφ' ἅρματος.

Twice I received triumphal ovations. Three times I celebrated curule triumphs.

Suetonius (*Aug.* 22) makes precisely the same statement with the necessary explanations: *Bis ovans ingressus est urbem, post Philippense et rursus post Siculum bellum. Curules triumphos tres egit, Delmaticum, Actiacum, Alexandrinum.* Conf. Liv. *Epit.* 133 *Tres triumphos egit, unum ex Illyrico, alterum ex Actiaca victoria, tertium de Cleopatra.* Both ovations in 40 and 36 B.C. were for victories in the civil war, though Augustus (V. 1) represents the victory over Sex. Pompeius as the clearing of the sea from pirates and the conclusion of a slave war. The triumph after Actium was ostensibly to celebrate the victory over Cleopatra. That to commemorate the annexation of Egypt was less ambiguous, but the best deserved triumph was that for the useful frontier work accomplished by the Illyrian campaigns between 36 and 33 B.C. (Dio Cass. 51. 21).

I. 21–22. *Et appellatus sum viciens semel imperator.*

2. 9–10. Εἰκοσάκις καὶ ἅπαξ προσηγορεύθην αὐτοκράτωρ.

Twenty times and one did I receive the appellation of imperator.

In the official nomenclature of Augustus and most of his successors the title *imperator* occurs twice, first as a *praenomen*, and again with a number attached to it. The latter marks a survival of the republican custom, by which a victorious general was saluted *imperator* by his soldiers, and was entitled in consequence to add the abbreviation *IMP.* to his name.

Under the principate this honour gradually became restricted to the *princeps*, as ultimate commander-in-chief, or to members of the imperial family. Tacitus mentions its conferment on Blaesus in Africa under Tiberius as the last occasion of the older usage (*Ann.* 3. 74). The number of salutations naturally varied with the number of military successes, but it also depended partly on the character of the *princeps*, who might, like Claudius, ostentatiously advertise every trivial success, or, like Tiberius, accept the honour rarely and with reluctance. With regard to Augustus, his statement is confirmed by Tacitus (*Ann.* 1. 9), and can be proved in detail by inscriptions and coins, with the assistance in many cases of useful passages from Dio Cassius. Mommsen has an interesting survey of the evidence (pp. 11–18). All that I can do here is to indicate the dates and occasions of some of the more important acclamations. Octavian was *imp. I* after the battle of Mutina (Dio Cass. 46. 38); *imp. IV* after the defeat of Sex. Pompeius in 36 B.C.; *imp. V* in the course of the Dalmatian campaigns; *imp. VI* after Actium; *imp. VII* in 29 B.C. for the success of Licinius Crassus, proconsul of Macedonia over the Moesian and Dacian tribes on the lower Danube (Dio Cass. 51. 25); *imp. IX* to commemorate the mission of Tiberius to Armenia in 20 B.C.: *imp. X* on the conquest of the Raeti and Vindelici in 15 B.C.; *imp. XI* on successes of Tiberius in Pannonia in 12 B.C.; *imp. XII* in 11 B.C. for victories of Drusus in Germany (Dio Cass. 54. 33); *imp. XIII* in 9 B.C., shared by Tiberius, who is now *imp. I*; *imp. XV* in A.D. 2 for successes of C. Caesar in Armenia (Dio Cass. 55. 11); *imp. XVII* in A.D. 6 for victories of Tiberius in Germany (Dio Cass. 55. 28); *imp. XIX* in A.D. 9 at the close of the Pannonian rebellion (Dio Cass. 56. 17); *imp. XX* in A.D. 11 for successes of Tiberius and Germanicus in Germany; *imp. XXI* not well attested but apparently after 26 June A.D. 14. Many of the inscriptions determining the dates of the acclamations will be found in Dessau, vol. i.

I. 22–24. *Cum deinde pluris triumphos mihi senatus decrevisset, eis supersedi. Item saepe laurus deposui, in Capitolio votis quae quoque bello nuncupaveram solutis.*

2. 10 sq. *Τῆς βουλῆς . . . . . ψηφισσ . . . . ων τὴν δάφνην . . . . . .*

Several later triumphs which the senate had decreed in my honour I refused. In like manner I again and again deposited the laurel wreath in the Capitol, when I performed the vows which I had solemnly made in each several war.

How many times Augustus refused triumphs is not stated, and is not important. There seems, however, sufficient evidence to justify his statement. According to Florus, iv. 12, he did so in 25 B. C., when the Salassi were exterminated and some successes gained against the Cantabri. He again refused a triumph in 20 B. C., when the eagles lost with Crassus were recovered. Dio's statement that he celebrated an ovation on this occasion is contradicted by Augustus himself, who claims only two ovations. (See above I. 21; Dio Cass. 54. 8.) A third triumph was, according to Dio Cassius 55. 6, refused in 9 B. C., when Tiberius gained some success in Germany.

The depositing of laurelled *fasces* in the Capitol in connexion with the fulfilment of vows was a republican custom retained by Augustus. A military commander, before setting out *paludatus* to his army or province, registered solemn vows (*vota nuncupavit*) in the Capitol. If he was, like Cicero, saluted *imperator* by his soldiers, he wreathed his *fasces* with laurel, and on his return to Rome, deposited his laurelled *fasces* '*in gremio Iovis Capitolini*' and at the same time discharged his vows. See Liv. 45. 39. So Augustus, after his return from Gaul and Germany, *τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ . . . ἐς τὸ Καπιτώλιον ἀνελθών, τήν τε δάφνην ἀπὸ τῶν ῥάβδων περιεῖλε, καὶ ἐς τὰ τοῦ Διὸς γόνατα κατέθετο* (Dio Cass. 54. 25). Presumably Augustus observed this precedent only on occasions when

he had actually been present in the province where the success was gained.

I. 24–27. *Ob res a me aut per legatos meos auspicis meis terra marique prospere gestas quinquagiens et quinquiens decrevit senatus supplicandum esse dis immortalibus. Dies autem, per quos ex senatus consulto supplicatum est fuere DCCCLXXXX.*

2. 15–20. Διὰ τὰ πράγματα ἃ ἢ αὐτὸς ἢ διὰ τῶν ὑποστρατήγων τῶν ἐμῶν κατώρθωσα, πεντηκοντάκις καὶ πεντάκις ἐψηφίσατο ἡ σύνκλητος θεοῖς δεῖν θύεσθαι. Ἡμέραι οὖν αὗται ἐκ συνκλήτου δόγματος ἐγένοντο ὀκτακόσιαι ἐνενήκοντα.

Five and fifty times did the senate decree that a supplicatio should be offered to the immortal gods on account of successes achieved on land or by sea by me or under my auspices by my legati. Furthermore, on eight hundred and ninety days was such supplicatio by decree of the senate offered up.

The number of occasions on which *supplicationes* were decreed, uncertain in the Latin, is supplied by the Greek version. Probably in most, if not all, cases where the imperial acclamation was received, a *supplicatio* was also received. Thus Dio (54. 9) speaks of *θυσίαι* in 20 B.C. when Augustus was acclaimed *imp. IX.* As compared with the greater successes marked by the imperatorial salutations, the number of *supplicationes* seems not excessive, nor was the extravagant precedent of 43 B.C. followed, when a fifty days' observance was decreed in honour of Hirtius, Pansa, and Octavian (Cic. *Phil.* 14. 14. 37). The number of days was always a multiple of five, and the figures given by Augustus show an average of fifteen days for each *supplicatio.*

I. 27–28. *In triumphis meis ducti sunt ante currum meum reges aut regum liberi novem.*

2. 20–22. *Ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς θριάμβοις πρὸ τοῦ ἐμοῦ ἅρματος βασιλεῖς ἢ βασιλέων παῖδες παρήχθησαν ἐννέα.*

In my triumphs there were led before my chariot kings or sons of kings to the number of nine.

It would have been easy for Augustus after Actium to have increased the number of these captive potentates. As a matter of fact, such kings as Polemon, Herod, and Antiochus were confirmed in their kingdoms, if they were content to become clients of Rome. We learn incidentally from Dio (51. 21) that a son and a daughter of Cleopatra were among the nine. Cf. also for another princeling id. 51. 2.

I. 28–30. *Consul fueram terdeciens, cum scribebam haec, et agebam septimum et trigesimum annum tribuniciae potestatis.*

2. 22, 23—3. 1. *Ὑπάτευον τρὶς καὶ δέκατον, ὅτε ταῦτα ἔγραφον, καὶ ἤμην τριακοστὸν καὶ ἕβδομον δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας.*

At the time of writing these records I have been consul thirteen times, and I am in the thirty-seventh year of my tribunician power.

With this must be compared *Ann.* 1. 9 *Numerus consulatuum celebrabatur, quo Valerium Corvum et C. Marium simul aequaverat; continuata per septem et triginta annos tribunicia potestas.* With regard to the consulships, we have seen that Octavian began the series in August 43 B. C., laying down his office on the formation of the triumvirate.

Nine years later in 34 B. C. Augustus became *cos. II*, though according to Suetonius he held the position for a few hours only. He was *cos. III interiecto anno* in 32 B. C. (Suet. *Aug.* 26). Then from 30 to 23 B. C. there followed an unexampled series of continuous consulships, V to X being held for the full twelve months. After 23 B. C., when a new phase of the principate began, though he was often begged to assume the consulship, and was sometimes, as in 19 B. C., even elected, he persistently

declined the office, and according to Suetonius accepted his twelfth and thirteenth consulships in 5 and 2 B.C. only for the purpose of celebrating the *deductio in forum* of the two young Caesars.

As to the *tribunicia potestas*, Augustus says himself: *sacrosanctus ut essem et ut, quoad viverem, tribunicia potestas mihi esset, lege sanctum est* (II. 21–3). But he assigns no date to the law, and the words leave it uncertain whether the *sacrosanctitas* was included under the *potestas* or granted separately. Appian (*B. C.* 5. 132) declares that Octavian received the tribunician power for life in 36 B.C., but two passages of Dio (49. 15 and 51. 19) favour the view that the two privileges were given separately, *sacrosanctitas* in 36 B.C., and the *tribunicia potestas* in 30 B.C. In the former the right given is described as τὸ μήτε ἔργῳ μήτε λόγῳ τι ὑβρίζεσθαι· εἰ δὲ μή, τοῖς αὐτοῖς τὸν τοιοῦτό τι δράσαντα ἐνέχεσθαι, οἵσπερ ἐπὶ τῷ δημάρχῳ ἐτέτακτο. In the latter Dio says: τὸν Καίσαρα τήν τε ἐξουσίαν τὴν τῶν δημάρχων διὰ βίου ἔχειν, καὶ τοῖς ἐπιβωμένοις αὐτόν, καὶ ἐντὸς τοῦ πωμηρίου καὶ ἔξω μέχρι ὀγδόου ἡμισταδίου ἀμύνειν. At any rate, Octavian, like Caesar, must have received the tribunician power for life from 30 B.C., if not before. But the thirty-seven years specified in the Monumentum and by Tacitus go back only to 23 B.C., and officially his *trib. pot. I* commenced on 27 June in that year, so that the *trib. pot. XXXVII* began on 27 June in the year A.D. 14, a few months before the death of the emperor. There can be no doubt that the explanation is to be found in the reconstruction of the principate made by Augustus in 23 B.C., when for the consulship he substituted the *tribunicia potestas* as *summi fastigii vocabulum*, and also as a means of dating the reign which officially began with *trib. pot. I* on 27 June 23 B.C. Tacitus refers somewhat vaguely to this change when he says (*Ann.* 3. 56): *id summi fastigii vocabulum Augustus repperit, ne regis aut dictatoris nomen adsumeret, ac tamen appellatione aliqua cetera imperia praemineret.*

CAP. V

I. 31–32. *Dictaturam et apsenti et praesenti mihi datam . . . a populo et senatu M. Marcello et L. Arruntio consulibus non accepi.*

3. 2–5. *Αὐτεξούσιόν μοι ἀρχὴν καὶ ἀπόντι καὶ παρόντι διδομένην ὑπό τε τοῦ δήμου καὶ τῆς συνκλήτου Μάρκῳ Μαρκέλλῳ καὶ Λευκίῳ Ἀρρουντίῳ ὑπάτοις οὐκ ἐδεξάμην.*

In the consulship of M. Marcellus and L. Arruntius I refused to accept the dictatorship, though it was offered me both in my absence and when I was in Rome by the people and senate.

This was in 22 B.C., the year after the modification in the form of the principate referred to above. For different reasons neither the senate nor the people approved the resignation of the consulship. The senate preferred Augustus to be a normal part of the restored republic rather than a controlling force outside it, and saw in the change the possibilities of more personal rule. The people took it to mean some relinquishment of his supreme direction of affairs, and were eager for more, not less, personal rule. It is clear from Dio's account (54. 1), that the senate was an unwilling agent, driven on by the people, and this is doubtless the reason for the order *a populo et senatu*. He says that the people, under the pressure of scarcity of corn, believed that the cause of their trouble was *ὅτι μὴ καὶ τότε ὑπατεύοντα τὸν Αὔγουστον ἔσχον*, and so *δικτάτωρα αὐτὸν ἠθέλησαν προχειρίσασθαι· καὶ τήν τε βουλὴν κατακλείσαντες ἐς τὸ συνέδριον, ἐπηνάγκασαν τοῦτο ψηφίσασθαι*. These violent proceedings could only have been, as Mommsen points out, during the absence of Augustus from Rome (*apsenti*). Later, when he had returned (*praesenti*), they offered the twenty-four *fasces*, and begged him *δικτάτωρα ἅμα λεχθῆναι καὶ ἐπιμελητὴν τοῦ σίτου, καθάπερ ποτὲ τὸν Πομπήϊον*

γενέσθαι. καὶ ὃς τοῦτο μὲν ἀναγκαίως ἐδέξατο . . . τὴν δὲ δικτατωρίαν οὐ προσήκατο.

As to the eagerness and pertinacity of the people in forcing the dictatorship upon Augustus, Suetonius (*Aug.* 52) and Velleius (2. 89) are emphatic witnesses.

I. 32–35. *Non recusavi in summa frumenti penuria curationem annonae, quam ita administravi, ut . . . paucis diebus metu et periculo quo erat populum universum meis impensis liberarem.*

3. 5–9. Οὐ παρῃτησάμην ἐν τῇ μεγίστῃ τοῦ σίτου σπάνει τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν τῆς ἀγορᾶς, ἣν οὕτως ἐπετήδευσα, ὥστ' ἐν ὀλίγαις ἡμέραις τοῦ παρόντος φόβου καὶ κινδύνου ταῖς ἐμαῖς δαπάναις τὸν δῆμον ἐλευθερῶσαι.

Amid the extreme scarcity of food I did not decline the charge of the corn supply, which I administered with such effect that within a few days by the money I expended I relieved the whole people from the panic and risk to which it was exposed.

That this refers to the same year 22 B.C. appears both from the evidently close connexion of lines 31–6, and from the passage of Dio. There had obviously been scarcity in the previous year, as in III. 11 Augustus states: *consul undecimum duodecim frumentationes frumento privatim coempto emensus sum.* This, however, had been an unofficial act of private liberality, though, as we learn from Velleius 2. 94, Augustus carried it out through the agency of his stepson, Tiberius, then quaestor at Ostia. Hitherto the charge of the distributions and of the corn supply generally had belonged to the republican magistrates, especially the *aediles Cereales*, and the expense had fallen on the *aerarium*. But in 22 B.C. the whole controllership of the corn supply (*cura annonae*) including charge of importation, gratuitous distribution, regulation of prices, was put into the hands of Augustus as a permanent

branch of administration. Dio says that the position was similar to that of Pompey after 57 B.C. At any rate, it involved the right to disburse public money to the extent required by efficient control. Whether Augustus, like Pompey, had the right of drawing upon the *aerarium* for the purpose, or used the revenues which the *imperium proconsulare* placed at his disposal (as some think, already belonging to the *fiscus*) is a matter of dispute. At any rate, Augustus, whether he increased the frumentations, or bought up large quantities of grain, or sold to the public at less than cost price, was administering state funds, and not spending his own fortune. At first Augustus employed as assistant curators two annually selected senators of praetorian or consular rank (Dio Cass. 54. 1 and 55. 26). But in A.D. 9 he substituted for these annual officials a permanent *praefectus annonae* of equestrian rank. Augustus in this statement of the Monumentum records the first acts of a permanent office, and not the assumption of administrative authority to meet a passing crisis.

I. 35–36. *Consulatum tum datum annuum et perpetuum non accepi.*

3. 9–10. Ὑπατείαν τέ μοι τότε διδομένην καὶ ἐνιαύσιον καὶ διὰ βίου οὐκ ἐδεξάμην.

At the same time, when the consulship was offered to me as an annual and lifelong office, I refused to accept it.

How unwelcome the resignation of the consulship was with the people is shown by the passage of Dio cited above (54. 1). That a *perpetuus consulatus* would have been agreeable to the senate is perhaps indicated by the action of Vitellius in styling himself *consul perpetuus* (Suet. *Vitell.* 11). It was no doubt in the course of the popular demonstrations described by Dio that the consulship was pressed on Augustus. *Annuus et perpetuus* are not inconsistent. There was to be an annual election, but Augustus would be privileged to hold the office every year. The case is not quite parallel with that of the

trib. pot., where the annual element comes out only in the enumeration of the years in which it was held. In 54. 10 Dio makes the manifestly false statement that in 19 B.C. Augustus received the consular power for life. This is not only inconsistent with the present statement of the Monumentum, but also with the fact that on two occasions Augustus took the *imperium consulare* for a special object (II. 5 and 8). Velleius (2. 89) testifies to the refusal of Augustus to continue his consulships beyond the eleventh, while Suetonius (*Aug.* 26) and Dio Cassius (54. 6) show that several unsuccessful attempts were made to force more numerous consulships upon him.

CAP. VI

I. 37–39. *Consulibus M. Vinucio et Q. Lucretio et postea P. et Cn. Lentulis et tertium Paullo Fabio Maximo et Q. Tuberone senatu populoque Romano consentientibus . . .*

3. 11–21. Ὑπάτοις Μάρκῳ Οὐινουκίῳ καὶ Κοίντῳ Λουκρητίῳ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα Ποπλίῳ καὶ Ναίῳ Λέντλοις καὶ τρίτον Παύλλῳ Φαβίῳ Μαξίμῳ καὶ Κοίντῳ Τουβέρωνι, τῆς τε συνκλήτου καὶ τοῦ δήμου τῶν Ῥωμαίων ὁμολογούντων, ἵνα ἐπιμελητὴς τῶν τε νόμων καὶ τῶν τρόπων ἐπὶ τῇ μεγίστῃ ἐξουσίᾳ μόνος χειροτονηθῶ, ἀρχὴν οὐδεμίαν παρὰ τὰ πάτρια ἔθη διδομένην ἀνεδεξάμην· ἃ δὲ τότε δι' ἐμοῦ ἡ σύνκλητος οἰκονομεῖσθαι ἐβούλετο, τῆς δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας ὢν ἐτέλεσα.

In the consulship of M. Vinicius and Q. Lucretius and again in that of P. and Cn. Lentulus and a third time in that of Paullus Fabius Maximus and Q. Tubero, though the senate and Roman people with one consent agreed that I should be elected superintendent of laws and public morals with supreme authority, I declined to accept any office inconsistent with the institutions of our ancestors,

and the domestic measures, which the senate desired to see carried out by my means, I effected as holder of the tribunician power.

It is fortunate that the Greek version has preserved this important statement. Augustus makes two distinct assertions: (1) that on three occasions, in 19, 18, and 11 B.C. he declined the *cura legum morumque* when pressed upon him by senate and people; and (2) that he carried out the legislation desired and indicated by the senate by means of his *tribunicia potestas*.

(1) It is clear from the phrase of Augustus himself ἐπὶ τῇ μεγίστῃ ἐξουσίᾳ as well as from Dio's expression ὥσπερ μοναρχίαν ἐλάμβανε (54. 30) that the *cura legum morumque* was virtually the dictatorship under another name. It combined the position of Sulla ἐπὶ θέσει νόμων ὧν αὐτὸς ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ δοκιμάσειε with the *praefectura morum* of Caesar, and in the latter connexion no doubt involved certain censorial activities which, as we shall see, both Suetonius and Dio misunderstood. The latter, however, agrees with the Monument in placing the origin of the new title in 19 B.C. He says (54. 10) ἐπιμελητής τε τῶν τρόπων ἐς πέντε ἔτη παρακληθεὶς διεχειροτονήθη, καὶ τὴν ἐξουσίαν τὴν μὲν τῶν τιμητῶν ἐς τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον, τὴν δὲ τῶν ὑπάτων, διὰ βίου ἔλαβεν. Later, under the year 12 B.C., he declares (54. 30) ὁ Αὔγουστος, ἐπιμελητής τε καὶ ἐπανορθωτὴς τῶν τρόπων ἐς ἕτερα πέντε ἔτη αἱρεθείς, . . . ὥσπερ . . . μοναρχίαν ἐλάμβανε. Suetonius on the other hand (*Aug.* 27), gives quite a different account: *recepit et morum legumque regimen aeque perpetuum, quo iure, quamquam sine censurae honore, censum tamen populi ter egit, primum ac tertium cum collega, medium solus.*

Now neither Suetonius nor Dio Cassius is a bad authority, and they might conceivably be nearer the truth than Augustus. But in this case they not only contradict one another, but both make statements which are demonstrably incorrect. If Suetonius had known of the *censoria potestas* spoken of by Dio, he would not have used the words *quamquam sine censurae*

honore, while the dates on which Augustus held the census were 28 B.C., (long before there was any question of the *cura legum morumque*), 8 B.C., and A.D. 13, and on two of these occasions Augustus declares that he made use of the *imperium consulare*, specially assumed for the purpose (II. 2–11). This last point disposes also of Dio's statement that Augustus received the consular power for life, impossible on other grounds as well; while the censorial power from 19 to 14 B.C., never reconferred as far as Dio's evidence goes, is objectless and explanatory of nothing. Why again should the second *quinquennium* of the *cura morum* have begun in 12 B.C., if the first expired in 14 B.C.?

Nor, as Mommsen points out, do certain contemporary expressions of Horace and Ovid discredit the assertion of Augustus. It is true that Horace (*Ep.* 2. 1. 1) says, *cum . . . res Italas . . . moribus ornes, legibus emendes*, and that Ovid (*Trist.* 2. 233) has *legum . . . tutela tuarum et morum*, but these expressions need refer only to the social and domestic legislation which Augustus declares that he accomplished through his tribunician power.

(2) As to the reality of legislation at the desire of the senate, we have the fullest confirmation from Dio. Under 19 B.C. (54. 10) Ψηφισάμενοι δὲ ταῦτα, διορθοῦν τε πάντα αὐτὸν καὶ νομοθετεῖν ὅσα βούλοιτο ἠξίουν· καὶ τούς τε νόμους τοὺς γραφησομένους ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, Αὐγούστους ἐκεῖθεν ἤδη προσηγόρευον, καὶ ἐμμενεῖν σφίσιν ὁμόσαι ἤθελον. The actual legislation is given under 19 B.C. (54. 16): Ὁ δ' οὖν Αὔγουστος ἄλλα τε ἐνομοθέτησε, καὶ τοὺς δεκάσαντάς τινας ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀρχαῖς ἐς πέντε ἔτη αὐτῶν εἶρξε. Τοῖς τε ἀγάμοις καὶ ταῖς ἀνάνδροις βαρύτερα τὰ ἐπιτίμια ἐπέταξε· καὶ ἔμπαλιν τοῦ τε γάμου καὶ τῆς παιδοποιίας ἆθλα ἔθηκεν. Augustus himself alludes to the moral reformation aimed at by his legislation (II. 12–14), and without express evidence to the contrary, we must certainly attribute these laws to the initiative of the *tribunicia potestas*. It would appear from Vell. 2. 91 and 92 that this extraordinary

position of authority was pressed upon Augustus after his return from the East in 19 B.C. During his absence there had been disorder and unrest, and in particular Egnatius Rufus had not only tried to secure the consulship, though of no more than aedilician rank, but had even made plots against the life of the *princeps*. The repetition of the offer in 11 B.C. is not otherwise recorded.

I. 39. *The Latin is wanting.*

3. 21–23. *Καὶ ταύτης αὐτῆς τῆς ἀρχῆς συνάρχοντα αὐτὸς ἀπὸ τῆς συνκλήτου πεντάκις αἰτήσας ἔλαβον.*

To assist me in this power, I five times asked for and received a colleague from the senate.

Agrippa was twice made *consors tribuniciae potestatis* and Tiberius three times. Agrippa first received the power in 18 B.C. (Vell. 2. 90; Dio Cass. 54. 12). He received it a second time, also for five years, in 13 B.C., but died soon afterwards (Dio Cass. 54. 28). Tacitus (*Ann.* 3. 56) says: *M. deinde Agrippam socium eius potestatis, quo defuncto Ti. Neronem delegit.* It was not, however, till 6 B.C. that Tiberius received the tribunician power for five years (Dio Cass. 55. 9; Vell. 2. 99). Before the five years were over Tiberius had withdrawn to Rhodes, and the time was allowed to run out without renewal. But after the deaths of Gaius and Lucius Caesar, Tiberius again received the tribunician power in A.D. 4 for ten years, *ne successor in incerto foret* as Tacitus says (Vell. 2. 103; Dio Cass. 55. 13). Lastly, in A.D. 13 Tiberius once more received a renewal of the power for five or perhaps ten years (Dio Cass. 56. 28). It must be remembered that Tiberius counted his *trib. pot. VI* from 27 June A.D. 4. Though the term *cooptavit* is more than once used of Augustus in this connexion, he is no doubt right in declaring that he made a request to the senate, a course strictly followed by Tiberius; *mittit litteras ad senatum quis potestatem tribuniciam Druso petebat* (*Ann.* 3. 56).

CAP. VII

I. 42–43. *The Latin is wanting.*

4. 1–2. *Τριῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐγενόμην δημοσίων πραγμάτων κατορθωτὴς συνεχέσιν ἔτεσιν δέκα.*

I was a member of the triumvirate for the organization of the republic during ten consecutive years.

This statement, repeated by Suetonius (*Aug.* 27), conveys the impression that the triumvirate lasted ten years and no more. This, however, implies that a second *quinquennium* was granted by law. For if the government after the first five years had been pure usurpation, it would have mattered little whether it lasted ten, eleven, or twelve years, and Augustus would not have been so precise as to the shorter period. We know from I. 9 *supr.*, from Appian, and from the *Fast. Colotian.* (*C. I. L.* i, p. 466) that the power was originally given till the last day of 38 B.C. According to Appian (*B. C.* 5. 95) *ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ χρόνος αὐτοῖς ἔλιγε τῆς ἀρχῆς, ἣ τοῖς τρισὶν ἐψήφιστο ἀνδράσιν, ἑτέραν ἑαυτοῖς ὥριζον πενταετίαν, οὐδὲν ἔτι τοῦ δήμου δεηθέντες.* With this Dio Cassius agrees by his silence as to a second law (48. 54). But in another passage (*Illyr.* 28) Appian speaks of confirmation by the people: *ἣν* (the second *πενταετία*) *ἐπὶ τῇ προτέρᾳ σφίσιν αὐτοῖς ἐψηφίσαντο, ὁ δὲ δῆμος ἐπεκεκυρώκει.* On the whole, I agree with the suggestion of Ferrero, that the power was retained without a law till August 37, when, after the conference at Tarentum, it was reconferred retrospectively from 1 Jan. 37 to the end of 33 B.C. But it is clear from the threats of Octavian to take away from Antony *τὴν ἐξουσίαν πᾶσαν*, and the promises of Antony to restore *τὸ πᾶν κράτος* (Dio Cass. 50. 4 and 7), that the power was illegally retained during 32, a fact naturally ignored by Augustus.

I. 44–45. *Princeps senatus fui usque ad eum diem, quo scripseram haec, per annos quadraginta.*

4. 2–5. *Πρῶτον ἀξιώματος τόπον ἔσχον τῆς συνκλήτου ἄχρι ταύτης τῆς ἡμέρας, ἧς ταῦτα ἔγραφον, ἐπὶ ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα.*

I have been princeps senatus for the space of forty years up to the day on which I write these records.

It was in the *lectio senatus*, which preceded the census of 29 B.C., that Augustus had himself enrolled as *princeps senatus*, reviving a pre-Sullan institution (Dio Cass. 53. 1). He had really held the position for over forty-one years, but, as nothing turned on the exact tenure of a merely honorary position, the round number is used.

I. 45, 46. *Pontifex, augur, quindecimvirum sacris faciundis, septemvirum epulonum, frater arvalis, sodalis Titius, fetialis fui.*

4. 5–7. *Ἀρχιερεύς, αὔγουρ, τῶν δεκαπέντε ἀνδρῶν τῶν ἱεροποιῶν, τῶν ἑπτὰ ἀνδρῶν ἱεροποιῶν, ἀδελφὸς ἀρουᾶλις, ἑταῖρος Τίτιος, φητιᾶλις.*

I have been a pontifex, an augur, one of the fifteen superintendents of sacred rites, one of the seven commissioners for religious banquets, one of the Arval brethren, one of the Titii sodales, and a fetialis.

In view of the consistent policy of Augustus to revive and utilize for political and moral objects the national religion of primitive Rome, this enumeration of sacerdotal dignities was of no secondary importance. The four great sacral colleges are given in order of rank, an order confirmed in numerous inscriptions containing senatorial careers. The emperors were always members of all four colleges, while the most distinguished senators are never credited with more than two. Octavian was made *pontifex* in the lifetime of Caesar (*pontificatus sacerdotio puerum honoravit*, Vell. 2. 59); and it appears from coins and inscriptions that he was a member of the other

three colleges before the end of the triumvirate. The last-named three colleges had long become obsolete, but Augustus revived them, and no better example can be cited of the dexterous combination of archaic ceremonies with political, perhaps more properly dynastic, requirements than is revealed in the partly preserved *Acta Fratrum Arvalium*.

CAP. VIII

II. 1. *Patriciorum numerum auxi consul quintum iussu populi et senatus.*

4. 8–10. *Τῶν πατρικίων τὸν ἀριθμὸν εὔξησα πέμπτον ὕπατος ἐπιταγῇ τοῦ τε δήμου καὶ τῆς συνκλήτου.*

In my fifth consulship I increased the number of patricians, acting on the instructions of the people and the senate.

Partly for the sake of establishing grades of social rank, partly to prevent certain patrician posts, like that of *flamen dialis*, from becoming obsolete, it was the policy of Caesar and Augustus, followed by Claudius and Vespasian, to ennoble a number of families by making them patrician. Claudius and Vespasian took the step by virtue of the censorial office which they had assumed, but both Caesar and Augustus acted on the authority of special laws passed for the purpose. This appears from Tacitus (*Ann.* 11. 25), who explains that Claudius took the step *exhaustis* (*gentibus*) *quas dictator Caesar lege Cassia, princeps Augustus lege Saenia sublegere.* Dio Cassius records the act of Caesar in 43. 27, that of Augustus in 52. 42, in neither case mentioning a law, though in the latter passage he confirms the statement of Augustus by noticing the preliminary decree of the senate: Τό *τε τῶν εὐπατριδῶν γένος συνεπλήθυσε, τῆς βουλῆς οἱ δῆθεν ἐπιτρεψάσης.* Dio states this after describing the *lectio senatus* of 28 B.C., but that Augustus rightly places it in 29 is indicated by the fact that a Saenius,

no doubt the author of the *lex Saenia*, was one of the *consules suffecti* at the end of 30 B.C.

II. 1–11. *Senatum ter legi. In consulatu sexto censum populi conlega M. Agrippa egi. Lustrum post annum alterum et quadragensimum feci. Quo lustro civium Romanorum censa sunt capita quadragiens centum millia et sexaginta tria millia. Iterum consulari cum imperio lustrum solus feci C. Censorino et C. Asinio cos. Quo lustro censa sunt civium Romanorum capita quadragiens centum millia et ducenta triginta tria millia. Tertium consulari cum imperio lustrum conlega Tib. Caesare filio meo feci Sex. Pompeio et Sex. Appuleio cos. Quo lustro censa sunt civium Romanorum capita quadragiens centum millia et nongenta triginta et septem millia.*

4. 10–5. 3. Τὴν σύνκλητον τρὶς ἐπέλεξα. Ἕκτον ὕπατος τὴν ἀποτείμησιν τοῦ δήμου συνάρχοντα ἔχων Μάρκον Ἀγρίππαν ἔλαβον, ἥτις ἀποτείμησις μετὰ δεύτερον τεσσαρακοστὸν ἐνιαυτὸν συνεκλείσθη. Ἐν ᾗ ἀποτειμήσει Ῥωμαίων ἐτειμήσαντο κεφαλαὶ τετρακόσιαι ἑξήκοντα μυριάδες καὶ τρισχίλιαι. Δεύτερον ὑπατικῇ ἐξουσίᾳ μόνος Γαΐῳ Κηνσωρίνῳ καὶ Γαΐῳ Ἀσινίῳ ὑπάτοις τὴν ἀποτείμησιν ἔλαβον. ἐν ᾗ ἀποτειμήσει ἐτειμήσαντο Ῥωμαίων τετρακόσιαι καὶ εἴκοσι τρεῖς μυριάδες καὶ τρισχίλιοι. Καὶ τρίτον ὑπατικῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τὰς ἀποτειμήσεις ἔλαβον ἔχων συνάρχοντα Τιβέριον Καίσαρα τὸν υἱόν μου Σέξτῳ Πομπηίῳ καὶ Σέξτῳ Ἀππουληίῳ ὑπάτοις· ἐν ᾗ ἀποτειμήσει ἐτειμήσαντο Ῥωμαίων τετρακόσιαι ἐνενήκοντα τρεῖς μυριάδες καὶ ἑπτακισχείλιοι.

Three times I held a lectio senatus, and in my sixth consulship with M. Agrippa as my colleague I carried out a census of the Roman people. I performed the lustrum after an interval of forty-two years. At this lustrum four millions and sixty-three thousand Roman citizens

were entered on the rolls.[1] *A second time, in the consulship of C. Censorinus and C. Asinius, I completed a lustrum without the help of a colleague invested with the consular imperium. At this second lustrum four million two hundred and thirty-three thousand Roman citizens were entered on the rolls. A third time, in the consulship of Sex. Pompeius and Sex. Appuleius, I completed a lustrum, being invested with the consular imperium and having my son, Tiberius Caesar, as my colleague. At this third lustrum four millions nine hundred and thirty-seven thousand Roman citizens were entered on the rolls.*

In the pre-Sullan republic the *lectio senatus* had been, if not a part of, at least an essential preliminary to the census. The automatic supply of the senate by ex-quaestors diminished the importance of the *lectio*, which, however, still remained a censorial function, and may sometimes have been carried out even during the forty-two years (70–28 B.C.) in which no census was completed. Apart therefore from other considerations, we should be inclined to connect the three occasions on which Augustus held a *lectio senatus* with the three dates on which he declares that he completed the census. These three dates are 28 B.C., 8 B.C., and A.D. 14, but in each case, while the actual *lustrum* was effected in these years, the census was arranged for and begun in 29 B.C., 9 B.C., and A.D. 13 respectively, and it would therefore be to these latter years that the *lectio* would have to be referred. That Augustus held the census at the three dates he mentions and that he states correctly the number of Roman citizens in the three years, cannot be doubted, though of the census in 8 B.C. no other trace or record survives. Nor is there any reason to think that a census was completed by Augustus, even if it was begun, in any other

[1] The total of the first census is wrong in the Greek version. In order to agree with the Latin, τετρακόσιαι ἑξήκοντα μυριάδες should be τετρακόσιαι ἓξ μυριάδες.

year. Between the first two completed *lustra* twenty years elapsed; between the second and third twenty-one years. There was probably some special reason, perhaps the preoccupations of Tiberius, why the third census was postponed for a year. Or if, as will be argued below, Augustus delayed a *lectio senatus* till after his adoption of Tiberius in A. D. 4, the extra year may be accounted for in that way, the interval between the *lectio* and the *lustrum* of A. D. 14 being exactly ten years. Suetonius (*Aug* 27) states that Augustus *censum populi ter egit, primum ac tertium cum collega, medium solus.* This is thought to come direct from the Monument, but the blunder of bringing this censorial activity under the *cura legum morumque* would have been impossible, if Suetonius had had the Monument before him, and the statement is therefore an independent confirmation.

What prevents us from accepting this view without further inquiry is the evidence of Dio Cassius, who, while omitting all reference to a census in two out of the three years mentioned by Augustus (8 B.C. and A. D. 14), speaks of a census on four distinct occasions, each time accompanied by a *lectio senatus*. The dates of these proceedings are represented as 29–28 B.C., 19–18 B.C., 12–11 B.C., and A.D. 4. About the census and *lectio senatus* of 29–28 B.C., there is no dispute. Suetonius (*Aug.* 35) and Dio Cassius (52. 42) agree that the senate numbered more than a thousand, many of its members being wholly unfitting and unworthy. Of these, sixty (Suet.) or fifty (Dio) were induced to retire voluntarily, while 140 were removed by Augustus and Agrippa, who are represented by both accounts as working together. It is clear from Dio that the *lectio senatus* began in 29, but his words τιμητεύσας σὺν τῷ Ἀγρίππᾳ . . . τὴν βουλὴν ἐξήτασε are misleading, for Augustus certainly did not assume the office of censor. On the contrary, his own statements show that it was as consul, or as holder for the occasion of the *consulare imperium*, that he held the census. How then are we to interpret the statement in

the *Fasti Venusini* (*C. I. L.* ix. 422, p. 47) under the year 28, *imp. Caesar VI, M. Agrippa II* (*cos.*); *idem censoria potestate lustrum fecerunt*? Mommsen supposes that a law was passed in 29 conferring the *censoria potestas* on the *consules designati*, and that Augustus and Agrippa retained this until the *lustrum* was completed next year. But after 1 Jan. no special grant was necessary, since the *censoria potestas* was clearly included in the *consulare imperium*, and in 29, if Augustus did not retain the consulship for the whole year, he was at any rate *omnium rerum potitus*. It seems to me that the analogy of municipal towns gives a better explanation. When a municipal magistrate is called *IIvir quinquennalis ex s. c. et d. d.*, we must assume that he was elected *IIvir* in the ordinary way, but that, when the Roman senate and the local *decuriones* decreed a census, he took the title of *IIvir quinquennalis* and exercised censorial powers. Similarly in 29 B.C. the senate decreed a census for the next year, so that on 1 Jan. the censorial powers of the consuls were automatically evoked, the proceedings in 29 being preliminary and, as far as Agrippa was concerned, unofficial. That the census and also the formal completion of the *lectio* belonged to 28, the sixth consulship, is clear from Dio (53. 1) καὶ τὰς ἀπογραφὰς ἐξέτελεσε· καὶ ἐν αὐταῖς πρόκριτος τῆς γερουσίας ἐπεκλήθη. The previous census had been held in 70 B.C. though, if the forty-two years are precise, the actual *lustrum* must have been in 69. The numbers on that occasion were 450,000, representing, perhaps not fully, enfranchised Italy, but excluding Cisalpine Gaul, and of course belonging to a period in which there were, with a single exception, no transmarine colonies or *municipia*. The next occasion on which, according to Dio, Augustus assumed the *censoria potestas* was in 19–18 B.C. We are told in 54. 10 that in the former year he received τὴν τῶν τιμητῶν ἐξουσίαν for five years along with the *cura morum* for the same time. The details of the census itself are not given, though Dio implies it, but under 18 B.C. we have a fairly detailed account of the *lectio*

senatus (τὸ βουλευτικὸν ἐξήτασε, 54. 13). After an unsuccessful attempt at combining selection and lot through a committee of thirty senators, αὐτὸς τὰ λοιπὰ ἀνελέξατο, καὶ αὐτὸς τοὺς ἐνδέοντας προσείλετο· ὥστε ἐς ἑξακοσίους τοὺς πάντας ἀποδειχθῆναι. Dio does not, like Suetonius, represent the census as taken by virtue of the *cura legum morumque*, but he clearly regards them as complementary to one another. I imagine that he found the *lectio* in his authorities, and possibly some statement of its authorization by the senate or people, and believing that a *lectio* was always part of a census, he describes the authorization as the grant of the *censoria potestas*. It seems to me that there was no longer a necessary connexion between a *lectio* and a census, though after a long period of disorder Augustus might combine them in 29 B.C., and though Claudius, as censor, did the same.[1] The silence of Augustus is conclusive against a census, which, indeed, under existing conditions was far too onerous to be repeated after only ten years, but the senate still contained 900 members, and Augustus, whose ten years' *imperium* was ending in 19, may well have decided to mark the opening of his second period and the semi-official position of Agrippa as *consors tribuniciae potestatis* on the one hand by a programme of social legislation, and on the other by a further purgation of the senate.

Again, only seven years later, in 12 and 11 B.C., Dio briefly and without detail reports a census and a *lectio senatus*. Incidentally remarking under 12 B.C. that Augustus did not visit the corpse of Agrippa, ὅτι τὰ τῶν τιμητῶν ἔπραττε, he states that next year ὁ Αὔγουστος ἀπογραφὰς ἐποιήσατο . . . καὶ τὴν βουλὴν κατελέξατο (54. 28 and 35). As this date stands in no symmetrical relation to that of any other census or *lectio*, being

[1] Mommsen also seems to assume that a *lectio* and a census involved one another, but recognizing that there could have been no census in 18, and that Dio's account of the *lectio* cannot be simply swept aside, he regards it as an informal purgation, which Augustus, unwilling to revive painful memories, did not include in his statement. The memories, however, were not more painful than those of 28.

seven years after the previous *lectio*, and three years before the certain census of 8 B.C., there is no alternative but to reject the statement as impossible. It is in 12 B.C. that Dio places a second grant of the *cura legum morumque* for five years, and in 11 B.C. that Augustus declares that he refused it a third time. Dio is not fortunate in his statements about this post, and he may have assumed that, as the first grant had been followed by a census and *lectio senatus*, so was the second.

In 9 and 8 B.C., though Dio knows nothing of it, Augustus held his second census, exactly twenty years after the first. Just as he had held the first by virtue of the *censoria potestas* dormant in his position as consul, so he now assumed, or was granted, the consular *imperium* for the purpose of censorial activity. As Tiberius was in Germany, and the two sons of Agrippa were still boys, he acted without a colleague. There being no record of this census except in the Monument, it is an open question whether this was one of the three occasions on which Augustus held a *lectio senatus*. Mommsen, sharing Dio's view that a census always involved a *lectio*, believes that he did. No one will deny that the official list of senators must have been revised up to date, but whether this deserved to be called a *lectio senatus*, requiring separate commemoration, depends mainly on whether the purgation assigned by Dio to 19 B.C. took place or not. My own view, as stated above, is that no *lectio* (almost with Augustus a euphemism for purgation) accompanied this census.

Under the year A.D. 4 we get a confused and partly inaccurate narrative from Dio (55. 13), out of which perhaps nothing emerges with clearness except that there was a *lectio senatus*. On the hypothesis that, after the joint census and *lectio* of 29–28 B.C., the method of Augustus was to hold alternately at ten years' intervals a *lectio* and a census, we should expect the *lectio* in A.D. 3. But Augustus was then in trouble; Tiberius was still away; C. Caesar was dead and L. Caesar was dying. On the other hand, in A.D. 4 he had settled the question of succession. Tiberius was his adopted son and had again received the

tribunicia potestas for five years, while he had himself adopted Germanicus. Dio himself emphasizes this firm position of Augustus in describing the steps taken: διαδόχους καὶ βοηθοὺς ἔχων, διαλέξαι τὴν γερουσίαν αὖθις ἠθέλησε. The parallel with 18 B.C. is perhaps not accidental. On both occasions Augustus was fortified against possible odium in the one case by Agrippa, in the other by Tiberius, as *consors tribuniciae potestatis*. As to the method of the *lectio*, Dio tells us: δέκα βουλευτὰς οὓς μάλιστα ἐτίμα προβαλόμενος, τρεῖς ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἐξεταστὰς ἀπέδειξεν, οὓς ὁ κλῆρος εἵλετο. The very peculiarity of the method adds probability to the story, since Suetonius in an enumeration of new officials created by Augustus (*Aug.* 37) speaks of *triumviratum legendi senatus*. But Dio feels bound to associate this *lectio* with a census actual or contemplated, and declares accordingly that Augustus αὐτὸς δὲ ἀπογραφὰς τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ κατοικούντων, καὶ μὴ ἐλάττω πέντε μυριάδων οὐσίαν κεκτημένων ἐποιήσατο, the poorer classes and transmarine citizens being omitted. To this impossible statement is added the equally impossible explanation, that, to avoid the appearance of acting as censor, ἀνθύπατον ἐξουσίαν πρός τε τὸ τέλος τῶν ἀπογραφῶν καὶ πρὸς τὴν τοῦ καθαρσίου ποίησιν προσέθετο. It is of course obvious that the *imperium proconsulare* could have no relation to either a census or a *lectio senatus*, but the blunder may cover the fact that some special authorization, as in 19 B.C., was given for the latter.

Exactly ten years later, in A.D. 14, Augustus declares that he completed his third census, invested once more with the consular *imperium*, and having Tiberius as his colleague. With regard to the latter, Suetonius (*Tib.* 21) tells us that a consular law had been passed in A.D. 13 *ut provincias cum Augusto communiter administraret, simulque censum ageret*. The last words imply either that Tiberius, like Augustus, had a special consular *imperium*, or at least some authorization to help Augustus. If the view taken above is correct, this census was not preceded by a formal *lectio senatus*.

As to the method by which the census was carried out on these three occasions, we have no information. For Italy, now including Cisalpine Gaul, we may assume that in their general lines the regulations for decentralization contained in the *lex Iulia Municipalis* were followed. In the provinces the returns were no doubt collected and sent in by the governors. That the number of Roman citizens had increased by nearly a million in the forty-one years, is a significant fact.

II. 12–14. *Legibus novis latis complura exempla maiorum exolescentia iam ex nostro usu reduxi, et ipse multarum rerum exempla imitanda posteris tradidi.*

5. 3–7. Εἰσαγαγὼν καινοὺς νόμους πολλὰ ἤδη τῶν ἀρχαίων ἐθῶν καταλυόμενα διωρθωσάμην, καὶ αὐτὸς πολλῶν πραγμάτων μείμημα ἐμαυτὸν τοῖς μετέπειτα παρέδωκα.

By the passing of new laws I restored many traditions of our ancestors, which were falling out of our observance, and in my own person I handed down many ideals which are worthy of imitation by posterity.

A somewhat more detailed statement to the same effect is made by Suetonius (*Aug.* 34): *leges retractavit et quasdam ex integro sanxit, ut sumptuariam, et de adulteriis et de pudicitia, de ambitu et de maritandis ordinibus.* Augustus is no doubt referring specially, though of course not exclusively, to the legislation of 18 and 17 B.C., to which he has already alluded as having been carried out through the *tribunicia potestas* (3. 21). The general aim of Augustus was to restore primitive virtue and simplicity. Suetonius is of course right in stating that, while some of the laws were old ones reinforced, others were fresh departures, but, if the Greek version is correct, that is not the point emphasized in the Monument. It is rather that he accomplished his aim partly by legislation, partly by the example of his own private life.

The passages in Dio referring to the laws of 18 and 17 B.C. have already been cited. Those specially alluded to were, the

leges Iuliae de pudicitia, de adulteriis (*Dig.* 48. 5) *et stupris*, in which the penalty was *relegatio* to separate islands, and *de maritandis ordinibus*. The principle embodied in the last law, the encouragement of marriage among all orders by rewards for the procreation of children and penalties for celibacy, had met with successful opposition in 29 B.C., and the law passed in 17 B.C., though not unopposed, was a milder one. But the whole marriage question was comprehensively and drastically dealt with in A.D. 9 in the *lex Iulia et Papia-Poppaea*, a section of which, the *lex caducaria* is referred to in *Ann.* 3. 28 *et lege Papia Poppaea praemiis inducti ut, si a privilegiis parentum cessaretur, velut parens omnium populus vacantia teneret.* The value of the law, perhaps not very great if measured by results, must be discounted by the fact that it introduced as a system the practice of *delatio*.

CAP. IX

II. 15–18. *Vota pro valetudine mea suscipi per consules et sacerdotes quinto quoque anno senatus decrevit. Ex iis votis saepe fecerunt vivo me ludos aliquotiens sacerdotum quattuor amplissima collegia, aliquotiens consules.*

5. 8–13. *Εὐχὰς ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐμῆς σωτηρίας ἀναλαμβάνειν διὰ τῶν ὑπάτων καὶ ἱερέων καθ' ἑκάστην πεντετηρίδα ἐψηφίσατο ἡ σύνκλητος. Ἐκ τούτων τῶν εὐχῶν πλειστάκις ἐγένοντο θέαι, τοτὲ μὲν ἐκ τῆς συναρχίας τῶν τεσσάρων ἱερέων, τοτὲ δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν ὑπάτων.*

The senate decreed that vows should be offered up on behalf of my health every fifth year by the consuls and priests. In accordance with these vows games were many times celebrated during my lifetime sometimes by the four most honourable colleges of priests, sometimes by the consuls.

We are dependent for this statement mainly on the Greek

version, though the blunder ἐκ τῆς συναρχίας τῶν τεσσάρων ἱερέων is fortunately cleared up in the Latin. Dio Cassius (53. 1) describes the games as originally instituted in 28 B.C. as τὴν πανήγυριν τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ νικῃ τῇ πρὸς τῷ Ἀκτίῳ γενομένῃ, and says: καὶ αὕτη διὰ πέντε ἀεὶ ἐτῶν μέχρι που ἐγίγνετο, ταῖς τέτταρσιν ἱεροσύναις ἐκ περιτροπῆς μέλουσα, λέγω δὲ κτλ. enumerating the *pontifices*, *augures*, *XVviri*, and *VIIviri* (see above, I. 45).

The games are referred to again in Dio Cass. (54. 19) under the year 16 B.C., which agrees with *quinto quoque anno*, since the series would run 28, 24, 20, 16, &c. Mommsen suggests that the *ludi pontificales* mentioned by Suetonius (*Aug.* 44) are the same games, so described as belonging to a year in which they devolved (ἐκ περιτροπῆς) on the *pontifices*.

Whatever may have been the case with regard to the *vota pro valetudine Caesaris*, there is no evidence that the games celebrated *quinto quoque anno* were ever given by the consuls. The rotation seems to have been strictly, in accordance with Dio's statement, confined to the four great priestly colleges. So many games were celebrated under Augustus, and commemorated on coins and medals, that it is not always easy to fix their identity, but, if Dio is right about the origin of these particular *ludi*, all must be eliminated except those offered in honour of Apollo.

II. 18–20. *Privatim etiam et municipatim universi cives sacrificaverunt semper apud omnia pulvinaria pro valetudine mea.*

5. 13–15. Καὶ κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ καὶ κατὰ πόλεις σύνπαντες οἱ πολεῖται ὁμοθυμαδὸν συνεχῶς ἔθυσαν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐμῆς σωτηρίας.

Moreover, the whole body of citizens, privately as individuals and publicly as municipalities, sacrificed without ceasing on behalf of my health at all the shrines.

Innumerable inscriptions both from Italy and the provinces bear out this boast of Augustus, and show how real and

personal was the regard felt for him throughout the Roman world. No allusion is here made either to his official or informal deification, and the two passages cited by Mommsen from Suetonius and Dio are not strictly relevant, though the former illustrates the word *municipatim*. Suetonius (*Aug.* 59) says: *Provinciarum pleraeque super templa et aras ludos quoque quinquennales paene oppidatim constituerunt.* Dio (51. 19) is speaking of libations to Augustus ἐν τοῖς συσσιτίοις οὐχ ὅτι τοῖς κοινοῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἰδίοις. The context in Suetonius would seem to show that the *ludi quinquennales* were offered direct to Augustus as a deity, and not, like those referred to in the previous lines of the Monument, offered to a god *pro valetudine Caesaris.*

CAP. X

II. 21. *Nomen meum senatus consulto inclusum est in Saliare carmen.*

5. 16–17. Τὸ ὄνομά μου συνκλήτου δόγματι ἐνπεριελήφθη εἰς τοὺς σαλίων ὕμνους.

By decree of the senate my name was inserted in the hymn of the Salii.

According to Dio (51. 20) it was decreed in 29 B. C. ἐς τοὺς ὕμνους αὐτὸν ἐξ ἴσου τοῖς θεοῖς ἐσγράφεσθαι. After the death of Germanicus Tiberius procured a decree *ut nomen eius Saliari carmine caneretur* (*Ann.* 2. 83).

II. 21–23. *Et sacrosanctus ut essem . . . et ut quoad viverem, tribunicia potestas mihi esset, lege sanctum est.*

5. 17–19. Καὶ ἵνα ἱερὸς ᾖ διὰ βίου τε τὴν δημαρχικὴν ἔχω ἐξουσίαν, νόμῳ ἐκυρώθη.

And by law it was enacted that I should be sacrosanct, and that I should possess the tribunician power during my life.

The original conferment of the tribunician power for life

is usually assigned to 36 B. C. after the deposition of Lepidus. But the statements of Appian (5. 132) and Dio Cassius (49. 15) are not entirely consistent. The former says that, with a view of urging him to relinquish the triumviral position, *αὐτὸν . . . εἵλοντο δήμαρχον ἐς ἀεί*. The latter says: *ἐψηφίσαντο μήτε ἔργῳ μήτε λόγῳ τι ὑβρίζεσθαι. Εἰ δὲ μή, τοῖς αὐτοῖς τὸν τοιοῦτό τι δράσαντα ἐνέχεσθαι, οἵσπερ ἐπὶ τῷ δημάρχῳ ἐτέτακτο*. The motive suggested by Appian for the grant of the perpetual tribuneship cannot be correct, since the latter could never have compensated for the loss of the triumviral power, and Dio's assertion that Augustus was at first made *sacrosanctus* is, I think, confirmed by the statement in the Monument. To the objection that, if Augustus had been referring to two conferments, he would have used not *lege* but *legibus*, I reply that *lege* is used to contrast the nature of the present grants with that of those previously mentioned, which was *senatus consulto*. On this view the *tribunicia potestas* was given for life in 30 B. C., under which year Dio declares (51. 19) that Octavian received *τὴν ἐξουσίαν τὴν τῶν δημάρχων διὰ βίου*. The phrase *comitia tribuniciae potestatis* often used in the *Acta Fratrum Arvalium*, while it implies the popular origin of the power, is as consistent with its conferment by law as by election, while Dio's words *τοῖς τε ἄλλοις καὶ τῇ δημαρχικῇ ἐξουσίᾳ ἐν νόμῳ δή τινι ἐχρήσατο* (53. 32) point in the same direction. There is no reason to think that the extended use made of the *tribunicia potestas* after 23 B. C. when in a sense it became annual, i. e. as counted year by year, was accompanied by legislation, though Dio (53. 32) under that year repeats his statement, *ἡ γερουσία δήμαρχον αὐτὸν διὰ βίου εἶναι ἐψηφίσατο*.

II. 23–28. *Pontifex maximus ne fierem in vivi conlegae locum, populo id sacerdotium deferente mihi quod pater meus habuerat, recusavi. Cepi id sacerdotium aliquod post annos eo mortuo qui civilis motus occasione occupaverat, cuncta ex Italia ad comitia mea . . . tanta multi-*

tudine quanta Romae nunquam antea fuisse fertur coeunte P. Sulpicio C. Valgio consulibus.

5. 19–22—6. 1–6. Ἀρχιερωσύνην, ἣν ὁ πατήρ μου ἐσχήκει, τοῦ δήμου μοι καταφέροντος εἰς τὸν τοῦ ζῶντος τόπον, οὐ προσεδεξάμην. Ἧν ἀρχιερατείαν μετά τινας ἐνιαυτοὺς ἀποθανόντος τοῦ προκατειληφότος αὐτὴν ἐν πολειτικαῖς ταραχαῖς, ἀνείληφα, εἰς τὰ ἐμὰ ἀρχαιρέσια ἐξ ὅλης τῆς Ἰταλίας τοσούτου πλήθους συνεληλυθότος, ὅσον οὐδεὶς ἔνπροσθεν ἱστόρησεν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης γεγονέναι, Ποπλίῳ Σουλπικίῳ καὶ Γαΐῳ Οὐαλγίῳ ὑπάτοις.

I refused to be created pontifex maximus in the place of my colleague during his life, though the people offered me that priesthood, which my father had held. A few years later, in the consulship of P. Sulpicius and C. Valgius, when death removed the man who, taking advantage of civil strife, had secured that priesthood, I accepted the same; and so great was the multitude from all Italy that flocked to my election, that no such gathering at Rome had heretofore been recorded.

Augustus alludes to Lepidus, his colleague in the pontifical college (not of course in the triumvirate) with as much restraint as he had exhibited in practice. In the words of Livy's epitomator (*Epit.* 117) *In confusione rerum ac tumultu M. Lepidus pontificatum maximum intercepit.* Cf. Vell. 2. 63. When Lepidus in 36 B. C. lost his place in the triumvirate, we have the evidence of Appian (5. 131) that the people pressed the dignity upon Augustus, but that respect for religious precedent induced him to refuse. That he should have maintained this renunciation for twenty-three or twenty-four years longer is remarkable, especially as his work in reviving ancient ceremonies, establishing the *ludi saeculares*, and carrying his social and moral reforms would have received additional distinction as coming from the official head of the national religion. What eventually

happened Suetonius briefly records: *pontificatum maximum, quem nunquam vivo Lepido auferre sustinuerat, mortuo demum suscepit* (*Aug.* 31). Augustus places the election in 12 B. C., and this is confirmed by the *Fasti Praenestini* (*C. I. L.* i, p. 387). In placing it under 13 B. C. Dio (54. 27) perhaps, as Mommsen suggests, assumed that Augustus was elected immediately on the death of Lepidus.

With regard to the *comitia* for the office of *pontifex maximus*, the *lex Domitia* of 104 B. C., repealed by Sulla, but re-enacted by Labienus in 63, was still in force. This had substituted for co-option the principle of popular election (Dio Cass. 37. 37), so far modified, however, on religious grounds that not the whole people, but seventeen tribes selected by lot formed the electing body. To this effect Cicero (*de Leg. Agr.* 2. 7. 18) declares that it was enacted, *quod populus per religionem sacerdotia mandare non poterat, ut minor pars populi vocaretur.* The election was a very keen one in 63 when Caesar was appointed, and as it was not known beforehand which tribes would elect, there was sure to be a general gathering of country voters.

This of course in the case of Augustus was merely complimentary. The successors of Augustus were invested with the dignity by decree of the senate, though there were still formal *comitia pontificatus maximi*, like the *comitia tribuniciae potestatis*. Cf. Dessau 241, § 74 *ob comitia pontificatus maximi Othonis Augusti.*

CAP. XI

II. 29–33. *Aram Fortunae reduci iuxta* [?] *aedes Honoris et Virtutis ad portam Capenam pro reditu meo senatus consacravit, in qua pontifices et virgines Vestales anniversarium sacrificium facere iussit eo die quo consulibus Q. Lucretio et M. Vinucio in urbem ex Syria redi, et diem Augustalia ex cognomine nostro appellavit.*

6. 7–14. *Βωμὸν Τύχης Σωτηρίου ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐμῆς ἐπανόδου πρὸς τῇ Καπήνῃ πύλῃ ἡ σύνκλητος ἀφιέρωσεν· πρὸς ᾧ τοὺς ἱερεῖς καὶ τὰς ἱερείας ἐνιαύσιον θυσίαν ποιεῖν ἐκέλευσεν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐν ᾗ ὑπάτοις Κοίντῳ Λουκρητίῳ καὶ Μάρκῳ Οὐινουκίῳ ἐκ Συρίας εἰς Ῥώμην ἐπανεληλύθειν τήν τε ἡμέραν ἐκ τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐπωνυμίας προσηγόρευσεν Αὐγουστάλια.*

To commemorate my return from Syria in the consulship of Q. Lucretius and M. Vinucius, the senate consecrated an altar to Fortune the Home-comer near the temple of Honour and Virtue at the Porta Capena, and ordered the pontifices and Vestal virgins to celebrate thereon an anniversary sacrifice on the day of my return, a day which it styled the Augustalia after my name.

The entry of Augustus into Rome on his return from Syria and the Greek-speaking provinces was on 12 October 19 B. C. The statement of Augustus is confirmed by the *Fast. Amit.* under that day, cited by Mommsen: *Feriae ex senatus consulto quod eo die imp. Caesar Augustus ex transmarinis provinciis urbem intravit. araque Fortunae reduci constituta.* Dio Cassius, too (54. 10), says that *ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς ἐν τῇ ἀποδημίᾳ πραχθεῖσι, πολλὰ καὶ παντοῖα ἐψηφίσθη, ὧν οὐδὲν προσήκατο, πλὴν Τύχῃ τε ἐπαναγώγῳ (οὕτω γάρ πως αὐτὴν ἐκάλεσαν), βωμὸν ἱδρυθῆναι· καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν ἣν ἀφίξοιτο ἔν τε ταῖς ἱερομηνίαις ἀριθμεῖσθαι, καὶ Αὐγουστάλια ὀνομάζεσθαι.* The next statement in the Monument shows that Augustus entered Rome from Campania along the Via Appia, and this explains the site of the altar near the Porta Capena by which he made his entry.

The absence after which Augustus returned to Rome in 19 B. C. had been occupied with much important work in the Eastern provinces. The *maius imperium* in senatorial provinces, given to him in 23 B. C., had enabled him to carry out a thorough reorganization in Achaia and Asia, while an important settlement of the Eastern frontier had resulted from

the mission of Tiberius to Armenia and the diplomatic arrangement with Parthia leading to the restoration of the eagles.

CAP. XII

II. 34–37. *Senatus consulto eodem tempore pars praetorum et tribunorum plebi cum consule Q. Lucretio et principibus viris obviam mihi missa est in Campaniam, qui honos ad hoc tempus nemini praeter me est decretus.*

6. 15–20. *Δόγματι συνκλήτου οἱ τὰς μεγίστας ἀρχὰς ἄρξαντες σὺν μέρει στρατηγῶν καὶ δημάρχων μετὰ ὑπάτου Κοίντου Λουκρητίου ἐπέμφθησάν μοι ὑπαντήσοντες μέχρι Καμπανίας, ἥτις τειμὴ μέχρι τούτου οὐδὲ ἑνὶ εἰ μὴ ἐμοὶ ἐψηφίσθη.*

At the same time, by decree of the senate, a portion of the praetors and tribunes of the plebs, together with the consul, Q. Lucretius, and other men of note, were sent as far as Campania to meet my arrival, an honour which up to this day has been decreed to none other but myself.

Augustus clearly implies that this was a complimentary mission of an extraordinary nature, and that Lucretius accompanied it as consul, though it is surprising that he should be mentioned after the praetors and tribunes. Dio Cassius (54. 10) gives a version not entirely consistent with this. He states that Augustus and Sentius Saturninus were elected consuls for 19 B. C., and when Augustus refused to be consul, serious riots in the city prevented a colleague from being elected to Sentius. Thereupon the senate *πρέσβεις πρὸς τὸν Αὔγουστον, μετὰ δύο ῥαβδούχων ἕκαστον, ἔπεμψαν*, and Augustus *ἐκ τῶν πρεσβευτῶν αὐτῶν Κύϊντον Λουκρήτιον . . . ὕπατον ἀνέδειξε, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐς τὴν Ῥώμην ἠπείχθη*. Dio adds, *ἐπεὶ δὲ . . . αἵ τε ἀρχαὶ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι προαπαντῆσαί οἱ προπαρεσκευάσαντο, νύκτωρ ἐς τὴν πόλιν ἐσεκομίσθη*. If this account is correct, two companies of magistrates were to have met Augustus, one actually sent as

envoys on the subject of the interrupted consular elections, the other a purely complimentary mission, which was forestalled by the rapid nocturnal entry of Augustus. Lucretius accompanied the first mission, but not as consul, though he returned as consul on the designation of Augustus. Mommsen draws attention to certain *tesserae* dated April and June of this year, in which Sentius Saturninus is inscribed as consul apparently without a colleague (*C. I. L.* i. 742–3). It may be assumed that Augustus confused and combined the two missions, ignoring the facts that there had been disorders in Rome, and that he had made Lucretius consul in an irregular manner.

II. 37–41. *Cum ex Hispania Galliaque, rebus in his provinciis prospere gestis, Romam redi Ti. Nerone P. Quintilio consulibus, aram Pacis Augustae senatus pro reditu meo consacrari censuit ad campum Martium, in qua magistratus et sacerdotes et virgines Vestales anniversarium sacrificium facere iussit.*

6. 20–23—7. 1–4. Ὅτε ἐξ Ἱσπανίας καὶ Γαλατίας, τῶν ἐν ταύταις ταῖς ἐπαρχείαις πραγμάτων κατὰ τὰς εὐχὰς τελεσθέντων, εἰς Ῥώμην ἐπανῆλθον, Τιβερίῳ Νέρωνι καὶ Ποπλίῳ Κοιντιλίῳ ὑπάτοις, βωμὸν Εἰρήνης Σεβαστῆς ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐμῆς ἐπανόδου ἀφιερωθῆναι ἐψηφίσατο ἡ σύνκλητος ἐν πεδίῳ Ἄρεως, πρὸς ᾧ τούς τε ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ τοὺς ἱερεῖς τάς τε ἱερείας ἐνιαυσίους θυσίας ἐκέλευσε ποιεῖν.

When in the consulship of Tiberius Nero and P. Quintilius I returned to Rome from Spain and Gaul after settling the affairs of those provinces with success, the senate, to commemorate my return, ordered an altar to Pax Augusta to be consecrated in the Campus Martius, at which it decreed that the magistrates, priests, and Vestal virgins should celebrate an anniversary sacrifice.

With what feelings of enthusiasm and relief this return of Augustus was welcomed in 13 B.C. from a prolonged absence in the West, is shown by Horace in *Od.* 4. 5. In Gaul the sixty-four, or perhaps at first sixty, *civitates* were now distributed among the Tres Galliae, Aquitanica, Lugdunensis, and Belgica, while no doubt the arrangements were made for the cult of Rome and Augustus to be inaugurated next year by Drusus at Lugudunum. To secure the frontier, too, Drusus was placed in supreme command of the German legions. In Spain the Cantabri had been at last subdued, and it was probably at this time that the final delimitation was made between the two *provinciae Caesaris*, Lusitania and Tarraconensis. Colonies, too, were established (among them one styled Pax Augusta), and the status of town communities graduated, as we find in the schedules embodied in Pliny's *Natural History*. It was notable work, and started both Gaul and Spain along distinct but kindred lines of development. Dio makes no mention of the altar of Peace, but speaks of a proposal to erect an altar in the senate house (54. 25): Ὁ γοῦν Αὔγουστος, ἐπειδὴ πάντα τά τε ἐν ταῖς Γαλατίαις καὶ τὰ ἐν ταῖς Γερμανίαις ταῖς τ' Ἰβηρίαις . . . διῳκήσατο, . . . αὐτὸς ἐς τὴν Ῥώμην ἐπί τε τοῦ Τιβερίου καὶ ἐπὶ Κνϊντιλίου Οὐάρου ὑπάτων ἀνεκομίσθη. . . . Ἥ τε βουλὴ ἠθροίσθη, καὶ ἔδοξε σφίσιν ἄλλα τε καὶ βωμὸν ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ βουλευτηρίῳ ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ Αὐγούστου ἐπανόδου ποιήσασθαι. We have, however, convincing corroboration of the Monument in the *Fasti Amiternini* under 4 July 13 B.C.; *Feriae ex senatus consulto quod eo die ara Pacis Augustae in Campo Martio constituta est Nerone et Varo consulibus.* That the actual dedication took place on 9 Jan. 1 B.C. is proved by the *Fasti Praenestini.* Prof. Pelham (*Essays in Roman History*, p. 30) draws attention to the striking work done in reconstructing the stately reliefs on this altar which recent excavations have brought to light. (See also Mrs. Strong, Roman Sculpture, pp. 40. foll.)

CAP. XIII

II. 42–45. *Ianum Quirinum quem claussum esse maiores nostri voluerunt, cum per totum imperium populi Romani terra marique esset parta victoriis pax, cum prius, quam nascerer, a condita urbe bis omnino clausum fuisse prodatur memoriae, ter me principe senatus claudendum esse censuit.*

7. 5–10. *Πύλην Ἐννάλιον, ἣν κεκλῖσθαι οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἠθέλησαν εἰρηνευομένης τῆς ὑπὸ Ῥωμάοις πάσης γῆς τε καὶ θαλάσσης, πρὸ μὲν ἐμοῦ, ἐξ οὗ ἡ πόλις ἐκτίσθη, τῷ παντὶ αἰῶνι δὶς μόνον κεκλεῖσθαι ὁμολογεῖται, ἐπὶ δὲ ἐμοῦ ἡγεμόνος, τρὶς ἡ σύνκλητος ἐψηφίσατο κλεισθῆναι.*

Whereas our ancestors have willed that the gateway of Ianus Quirinus should be shut, whenever victorious peace is secured by sea and by land throughout the empire of the Roman people, and whereas before my birth twice only in all is it on record that the gateway has been shut, three times under my principate has the senate decreed that it should be shut.

Suetonius (*Aug.* 22) makes the same statement, which was no doubt a commonplace of history. *Ianum Quirinum semel atque iterum a condita urbe ante memoriam suam clausum in multo breviore temporis spatio terra marique pace parta ter clusit.* Livy (1. 19) fixes the two occasions under the republic, first under king Numa and again after the first Punic war in 235 B. C. He also alludes in the same passage to what, when he wrote, was a recent and much talked of occurrence, the closing of the Ianus gate by Octavian after Actium. Dio Cassius (51. 20) also states that the gate was then shut *πάντων σφίσι τῶν πολέμων παντελῶς πεπαυμένων*. It was closed for the second time in 26 B. C. when the tedious wars with the Cantabri seemed concluded. Dio states the fact in 53. 26, adding that the

temple was opened after its previous closing only on account of troubles with this tribe. *καὶ τὸ τοῦ Ἰανοῦ τεμένισμα ἀνοῖχθεν δι' αὐτοὺς ἔκλεισεν.* There is no trustworthy record of the third occasion on which Augustus closed the gateway. Dio (54. 36) declares that the senate decreed its closing in 10 B. C., and that only sudden trouble with the Dacians prevented it. We should have expected the German wars of Drusus, then in full swing, to have been a more effectual bar. It is difficult to find anything like an interval of general peace between 1 B. C. and the death of Augustus, and Mommsen is probably right in suggesting that the third closing may have been after the cessation of active warfare in Germany in 9 B. C. and before the Armenian war undertaken by C. Caesar in 1 B. C., a period for which Dio's history is not preserved.

CAP. XIV

II. 46—III. 1–6. *Filios meos, quos iuvenes mihi ripuit fortuna, Gaium et Lucium Caesares honoris mei caussa senatus populusque Romanus annum quintum et decimum agentis consules designavit, ut cum magistratum inirent post quinquennium. Et ex eo die, quo deducti sunt in forum, ut interessent consiliis publicis decrevit senatus. Equites autem Romani universi principem iuventutis utrumque corum parmis et hastis argenteis donatum appellaverunt.*

7. 11–20. *Υἱούς μου Γάϊον καὶ Λεύκιον Καίσαρας, οὓς νεανίας ἀνήρπασεν ἡ τύχη, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν τειμὴν ἥ τε σύνκλητος καὶ ὁ δῆμος τῶν Ῥωμαίων πεντεκαιδεκαέτεις ὄντας ὑπάτους ἀπέδειξεν, ἵνα μετὰ πέντε ἔτη εἰς τὴν ὕπατων ἀρχὴν εἰσέλθωσιν· καὶ ἀφ' ἧς ἂν ἡμέρας εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν καταχθῶσιν, ἵνα μετέχωσιν τῆς συνκλήτου ἐψηφίσατο. Ἱππεῖς δὲ Ῥωμαίων σύνπαντες ἡγεμόνα νεότητος*

ἑκάτερον αὐτῶν προσηγόρευσαν, ἀσπίσιν ἀργυρέαις καὶ δόρασιν ἐτείμησαν.

Out of honour to my person my sons, Gaius and Lucius Caesar, snatched from me in their youth by fortune, were designated consuls by the senate and Roman people in their fifteenth year, with permission to enter on the magistracy five years later. The senate further decreed that from the day on which they were conducted into the forum, they should be admitted to its sovereign counsels. Furthermore, the whole body of Roman knights presented both my sons with silver shields and spears, and saluted them as principes Iuventutis.

It is certain that Augustus hoped to secure from the marriage of Agrippa and Iulia a settlement of the succession. In 20 B.C. G. Caesar was born (Dio Cass. 54. 8); in 18 Agrippa was made *consors tribuniciae potestatis*, more as a colleague than a destined successor; in 17 Lucius Caesar was born (Dio Cass. 54. 18), and in the same year both brothers were adopted by their grandfather. Dio (*loc. cit.*) gives the date, and calls the two young princes at once διαδόχους τῆς ἀρχῆς. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1. 3 *nam genitos Agrippa Gaium ac Lucium in familiam Caesarum induxerat.* After the death of Agrippa in 12 B.C. Augustus certainly regarded them as his successors, and in 6 B.C., while giving the *tribunicia potestas* to Tiberius, he sought to give a still more distinguished position to Gaius, who was now fourteen. It seems that in some form the question was raised this year of conferring the consulship on Gaius. Dio (55. 9) represents the suggestion as coming from the eleven year old Lucius, and Augustus as putting it aside, though giving Gaius senatorial rank. Tacitus (1. 3) implies that the refusal of Augustus was reluctant: *Gaium et Lucium . . . necdum posita puerili praetexta principes iuventutis appellari, destinari consules specie recusantis flagrantis-*

sime cupiverat. The course actually taken must have been a compromise, and we may reconstruct the course of events as follows. Towards the close of 6 B.C. the senate decreed that Gaius should be elected consul by the people, but should remain *consul designatus* for a *quinquennium*, i.e. till A.D. 1; and also that from the date of his taking the *toga virilis*, or being conducted to the forum, he should enjoy the privileges of a senator. That this decree was prior to the *deductio in forum*, a fact concealed by the Latin of the Monument, is proved by the Greek, *ἀφ' ἧς ἂν ἡμέρας . . . καταχθῶσιν*, while from Suetonius (*Aug.* 26) we know that the *deductio* was in 5 B.C., when Augustus was *cos. XII. Duodecimum magno, id est septemdecim annorum, intervallo et rursus tertium decimum biennio post ultro petit, ut Gaium et Lucium filios amplissimo praeditus magistratu . . . quemque . . . deduceret in forum.* This passage reminds us of what the condensed statement of Augustus tends to conceal, that there was an interval of three years between the identical procedure taken in the cases of Gaius and Lucius respectively. At the beginning, therefore, of 5 B.C., Gaius Caesar, having completed his fourteenth but not yet his fifteenth year, publicly assumed the *toga virilis*, and at once became a senator. The meaning of *consiliis publicis interesse* is explained by the Greek version, and also by the words of Dio (55. 9), *τὴν ἐς τὸ συνέδριον συμφοίτησιν καὶ τὸ συνθεᾶσθαι . . . τῇ βουλῇ ἔδωκε.*[1] Later in 5 B.C., perhaps as Mommsen suggests in March, Gaius was elected consul by the *comitia* with a five years' *designatio.* As a matter of fact, he was one of the *consules suffecti* in A.D. 1.

Exactly the same series of steps was taken in the case of Lucius in 3 B.C., when the *s.c.* was passed, and in 2 B.C., when Augustus as *cos. XIII* conducted him to the forum (Suet. *loc. cit.*) and the people elected him consul. The con-

[1] Dio places this in 6 B.C. before the *deductio in forum*, but, as is probable, he is really alluding to the anticipatory *senatus consultum*, the statement involves no such difficulty as Mommsen sees in it.

sulship would have been in A.D. 4, but Lucius died in August A.D. 2.

With regard to the salutation by the *equites* as *princeps iuventutis*, we must of course again understand that Gaius was so saluted in 5 B.C., and Lucius in 2 B.C., though the title in each case was a permanent one, so that after 2 B.C. both the young Caesars held it together. This is proved by the twin *tituli* (Dessau, 131 and 132) belonging to 2 or 1 B.C., or the earlier part of A.D. 1: (a) *C. Caesari Augusti f. pontifici cos. designato principi iuventutis.* (b) *L. Caesari Augusti f. auguri cos. designato principi iuventutis.* This seems to dispose of the view that *princeps iuventutis* was equivalent to *sevir* of the first *turma* of *equites*, when that honour was held by a member of the imperial family. There was obviously no conferment either of a title or an office, but a prearranged salutation, undoubtedly intended to mark its object, the *princeps* of the younger generation, as successor to the ruler, or *princeps* of the citizens collectively.[1] The occasion of the salutation is not stated, but none would seem more appropriate than that of the *deductio in forum.*

It was the conferment of these significant honours on Gaius in 5 B.C. which led to the retirement of Tiberius to Rhodes, and the non-renewal of his *tribunicia potestas* in 1 B.C. But the hopes of Augustus were shattered. He begins his testament with the words: *quoniam atrox fortuna Gaium et Lucium filios miki eripuit* (Suet. *Tib.* 23). Lucius died in Spain in A.D. 2, and Gaius after the lingering effects of a wound received in Armenia in A.D. 4. Tiberius again received the *tribunicia potestas* and was adopted. (See the decrees of the *decuriones* at Pisa after the deaths of the two young princes, in Dessau, 139 and 140.)

[1] This seems to me far more probable than Mommsen's suggestion that the title contrasted with *princeps senatus*, for (*a*) that title was not specially associated with Augustus' general position, and (*b*) the young Caesars were now themselves senators.

It appears from Tacitus (*Ann.* 12. 41) that Claudius, in marking out for the succession his stepson Nero, followed with remarkable closeness the example of Augustus. *Et Caesar adulationibus senatus libens cessit, ut vicensimo aetatis anno consulatum Nero iniret, atque interim designatus proconsulare imperium extra urbem haberet, ac princeps iuventutis appellaretur.* Later on, Titus and Domitian were simultaneously styled *principes iuventutis.*

CAP. XV

[The gifts and *congiaria* which follow, ranging from 44 to 2 B.C., are numbered for the sake of distinction.]

(1) III. 7–8. *Plebei Romanae viritim* $\overline{HS}$. *trecenos numeravi ex testamento patris mei;*

7. 21–24. Δήμῳ Ῥωμαίων κατ' ἄνδρα ἑβδομήκοντα πέντε δηνάρια ἑκάστῳ ἠρίθμησα κατὰ διαθήκην τοῦ πατρός μου,

In accordance with the testament of my father, I paid to every individual of the Roman plebs three hundred sesterces;

This was of course in 44 B.C., and the sum paid to each citizen is confirmed by Suet. *Caes.* 83 and Plut. *Anton.* 16. Dio (44. 35) gives us a warning of his occasional inaccuracy, by stating that on the authority of Augustus himself the sum paid was 120 sesterces. If the recipients numbered 250,000 (see below), the total would be 75,000,000 sesterces. If we put together two statements of Suetonius, (*a*) that before Caesar's *recensus* there were 320,000 corn recipients (*Caes.* 41), and (*b*) that he sent away 80,000 persons to transmarine colonies, we get approximately the 250,000 who benefited by his testament. Augustus had to raise the money himself, as Antony had appropriated Caesar's property.

(2) III. 8–9. *et nomine meo* $\overline{HS}$. *quadringenos ex bellorum manibiis consul quintum dedi;*

7. 24—8. 1. καὶ τῷ ἐμῷ ὀνόματι ἐκ λαφύρων πολέμου ἀνὰ ἑκατὸν δηνάρια πέμπτον ὕπατος ἔδωκα,

and in my fifth consulship I gave four hundred sesterces to each person out of the spoils of war;

This gratuity on the same calculation cost 100,000,000 sesterces. It was made in 29 B.C. by Augustus on the occasion of his triple triumph. Dio Cassius (51. 21) says: καὶ τοῖς στρατιώταις ἔδωκέ τινα (perhaps referring to no. 7, see below) τῷ τε δήμῳ καθ' ἑκατὸν δραχμάς, προτέροις μὲν τοῖς ἐς ἄνδρας τελοῦσιν, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τοῖς παισὶ, διὰ τὸν Μάρκελλον τὸν ἀδελφιδοῦν, διένειμε.

(3) III. 9–11. *iterum autem in consulatu decimo ex patrimonio meo* $\overline{HS}$. *quadringenos congiari viritim permumeravi;*

8. 1–4. πάλιν τε δέκατον ὑπατεύων ἐκ τῆς ἐμῆς ὑπάρξεως ἀνὰ δηνάρια ἑκατὸν ἠρίθμησα,

a second time again in my tenth consulship I paid out of my own patrimonium a congiarium of four hundred sesterces to every person;

This second gratuity of 100,000,000 sesterces was given by Augustus in 24 B.C. on his return to Rome after the conquest of the Cantabri. καὶ τῷ δήμῳ καθ' ἑκατὸν δραχμὰς δώσειν ὑπέσχετο, τό τε γράμμα τὸ περὶ αὐτῶν ἀπηγόρευσε μὴ πρότερον ἐκτεθῆναι πρὶν ἂν καὶ ἐκείνῃ (τῇ βουλῇ) συνδόξῃ (Dio Cass. 53. 28). As the money was to be paid from his own *patrimonium*, this was a somewhat extreme and unreal show of deference to the senate.

(4) III. 11–12. *et consul undecimum duodecim frumentationes frumento privatim coempto emensus sum;*

8. 4–5. καὶ ἑνδέκατον ὕπατος δώδεκα σειτομετρήσεις ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ βίου ἀπεμέτρησα,

in my eleventh consulship I gave by measure twelve special allowances of corn out of grain purchased with my own money;

This year, 23 B.C., and the next were years of scarcity, and, as we have already seen (see above on I. 33, &c.), this was the last instance of a private benefaction in the shape of extra distributions of corn. In the following year Augustus introduced a new system by undertaking himself the *cura annonae.*

(5) III. 12–15. *et tribunicia potestate duodecimum quadringenos nummos tertium viritim dedi. Quae mea congiaria pervenerunt ad hominum millia nunquam minus quinquaginta et ducenta.*

8. 5–8. καὶ δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ δωδέκατον ἑκατὸν δηνάρια κατ' ἄνδρα ἔδωκα. Αἵτινες ἐμαὶ ἐπιδόσεις οὐδέποτε ἧσσον ἦλθον εἰς ἄνδρας μυριάδων εἴκοσι πέντε.

and in the twelfth year of my tribunician power I for the third time gave to every person four hundred sesterces. These my gratuities were never bestowed on less than two hundred and fifty thousand people.

This *congiarium* was after the death of Agrippa in 12 B.C., and according to Dio (54. 29) was made out of the money which came to Augustus from the testament of his friend and colleague. καὶ καθ' ἑκατὸν δραχμὰς τῷ δήμῳ, ὡς καὶ ἐκείνου κελεύσαντος, διένειμε. We must suppose that down at any rate to 12 B.C. Augustus made use of a list of the *plebs urbana*, perhaps roughly revised from time to time, containing the names of about 250,000 persons.

(6) III. 15–17. *Tribuniciae potestatis duodevicensimum consul XII trecentis et viginti millibus plebis urbanae sexagenos denarios viritim dedi.*

8. 9–12. *Δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας ὀκτωκαιδέκατον ὕπατος δωδέκατον τριάκοντα τρισὶ μυριάσιν ὄχλου πολειτικοῦ ἑξήκοντα δηνάρια κατ' ἄνδρα ἔδωκα.*

In the eighteenth year of my tribunician power and my twelfth consulship I gave to each of three hundred and twenty thousand persons of the urban plebs the sum of sixty denarii.

The date of this gratuity, costing 76,800,000 sesterces, is limited to the first half of 5 B.C., as the eighteenth *trib. pot.* ended on 26 June of that year. Though it is not recorded by any historian, Dio failing us for these years, it fits in appropriately with the *deductio in forum* of Gaius Caesar, above referred to, and no doubt celebrated that event. The larger number of recipients admits of only conjectural explanation. I suggest two possibilities. (*a*) The Roman plebs may have been increasing during the previous twenty years, and though Augustus had so far not extended his gratuities beyond the number contained in existing lists, there may have been some discontent among the excluded. On this auspicious occasion Augustus may have given way to this feeling, and, perhaps arbitrarily, restored what had been the maximum before Caesar's *recensus* in 46 B.C. (Suet. *Caes.* 41). (*b*) The term *plebs urbana* may have been wider than *plebs Romana*, and may have included certain categories of aliens. There is, however, no evidence for this use of the term, and I prefer the other explanation. The number, however, was too large, and it may have been the necessity of giving way on this occasion which led to a second *recensus*. (See below.)

(7) III. 17–19. *In colonis militum meorum consul quintum ex manibiis viritim millia nummum singula dedi; acceperunt id triumphale congiarium in colonis hominum circiter centum et viginti millia.*

8. 12–15. *Καὶ ἀποίκοις στρατιωτῶν ἐμῶν πέμπτον*

ὕπατος ἐκ λαφύρων κατ' ἄνδρα ἀνὰ διακόσια πεντήκοντα δηνάρια ἔδωκα· ἔλαβον ταύτην τὴν δωρεὰν ἐν ταῖς ἀποικίαις ἀνθρώπων μυριάδες πλεῖον δώδεκα.

In my fifth consulship I gave out of the spoils of war one thousand sesterces to each of my soldiers settled in a colony. This gratuity to celebrate my triumph was received by about one hundred and twenty thousand persons in the colonies.

This, as explained in connexion with the statements in I. 16, &c., and III. 22–6, refers to the Italian colonization of veterans in 29 B.C. It was clearly part of the same scheme of gratuities as that recorded above (no. 2) under the same year, and, like this, provided for out of the *manubiae*. Why it is taken out of its proper order in time, and made to separate the two closely connected *congiaria* of 5 and 3 B.C., is not clear. I can only suggest that its insertion is an afterthought. Augustus at first passed it over as one of the gifts to soldiers which he is carefully excluding from this list, but on second thoughts inserted it, as really a *congiarium* to civilians. The amount is the largest here mentioned, 120,000,000 sesterces.

(8) III. 19–21. *Consul tertium decimum sexagenos denarios plebei, quae tum frumentum publicum accipiebat, dedi; ea millia hominum paullo plura quam ducenta fuerunt.*

8. 15–18. Ὕπατος τρισκαιδέκατον ἀνὰ ἑξήκοντα δηνάρια τῷ σειτομετρουμένῳ δήμῳ ἔδωκα. οὗτος ἀριθμὸς πλείων εἴκοσι μυριάδων ὑπῆρχεν.

In my thirteenth consulship I gave the sum of sixty denarii to every individual among the plebs who at that time was in receipt of public corn. The number of recipients was a little more than two hundred thousand persons.

We have seen that the proceedings in connexion with the *deductio in forum*, designation as consuls, and salutation as *principes iuventutis* were exactly the same in the cases of the two young Caesars in 5 and 2 B.C. This makes it safe to assume that the *congiaria*, assigned by Augustus to these two years, each consisting of sixty *denarii* per head, are to be brought into relation with these celebrations, for the sake of which, according to Suetonius (*Aug.* 26), Augustus accepted his twelfth and thirteenth consulships. A fragment of Dio Cassius is preserved referring apparently to the second *congiarium*: καθ' ἕνα ἑξήκοντα δραχμὰς ἔδωκε (55. 10). But while in 5 B.C. there had been 320,000 recipients, in 2 B.C. there were only 200,000. As a matter of fact, the statements in the Monument as well as another fragment of Dio, clearly belonging to about the same period as that just cited, serve approximately to date and explain the *recensus* mentioned by Suetonius (*Aug.* 40). Dio says (55. 10), ὁ δὲ Αὔγουστος τὸ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ σιτοδοτουμένου πλῆθος ἀόριστον ὂν ἐς εἴκοσι μυριάδας κατέκλεισε. It seems therefore that, alarmed by the large numbers to whom he had given the *congiarium* in 5 B.C., he had between that year and 2 B.C. instituted a *recensus* like that of Caesar, and reduced the number of corn recipients to 200,000. For a vague summary of these gratuities see Suet. *Aug.* 41.

CAP. XVI

III. 22–28. *Pecuniam pro agris, quos in consulatu meo quarto et postea consulibus M. Crasso et Cn. Lentulo augure adsignavi militibus, solvi municipis. Ea summa sestertium circiter sexsiens milliens fuit, quam pro Italicis praedis numeravi, et circiter bis milliens et sescentiens, quod pro agris provincialibus solvi. Id primus et solus omnium, qui deduxerunt colonias militum in Italia aut in provincis, ad memoriam aetatis meae feci.*

8. 19-24—9. 1-3. Χρήματα ἐν ὑπατείᾳ τετάρτῃ ἐμῇ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ὑπάτοις Μάρκῳ Κράσσῳ καὶ Ναίῳ Λέντλῳ αὔγουρι ταῖς πόλεσιν ἠρίθμησα ὑπὲρ ἀγρῶν, οὓς ἐμέρισα τοῖς στρατιώταις. Κεφαλαίου ἐγένοντο ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ μὲν μύριαι πεντακισχείλιαι μυριάδες, τῶν δὲ ἐπαρχειτικῶν ἀγρῶν μυριάδες ἑξακισχίλιαι πεντακόσιαι. Τοῦτο πρῶτος καὶ μόνος ἁπάντων ἐπόησα τῶν καταγαγόντων ἀποικίας στρατιωτῶν ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ ἢ ἐν ἐπαρχείαις μέχρι τῆς ἐμῆς ἡλικίας.

In my fourth consulship (30 B. C.), *and afterwards in the consulship of M. Crassus and Cn. Lentulus the augur, I handed over sums of money to the municipalities in payment for the lands which I assigned to my soldiers. The total amount so paid over was about six hundred million sesterces for Italian lands, and about two hundred and sixty million sesterces for provincial lands. Of all who ever planted colonies of soldiers in Italy or in the provinces, I was the first and only statesman up to my own age to take this course.*

Our best information as to how Octavian settled his veteran soldiers in Italian colonies in his fourth consulship, 30 B. C., comes from Hyginus, *de Lim.* p. 177 (Lachm.), and Dio Cassius 51. 4. The former, cited by Mommsen, says: *Divus Augustus, postquam adsignavit orbi terrarum pacem, exercitus, qui aut sub Antonio aut sub Lepido militaverant, pariter et suarum legionum milites colonos fecit alios in Italia alios in provinciis: quibusdam, deletis hostium civitatibus, novas urbes constituit: quosdam in veteribus oppidis deduxit et colonos nominavit: illas quoque urbes, quae deductae a regibus aut dictatoribus fuerant, quas bellorum civilium interventus exhauserat, dato iterum coloniae nomine, numero civium ampliavit, quasdam et finibus.* I put on one side the statement about the armies of Antonius and Lepidus, because, however Octavian treated them, he

makes no mention of them in the *Monumentum*. It appears that the soldiers were settled in three classes of Italian towns. (*a*) The cities which had favoured Antony were practically repeopled by military colonists, a fact confirmed by Dio. (*b*) Soldiers were settled on the territories of long established communities, which were henceforth styled colonies. (*c*) Some obsolete colonial foundations were revived, in certain cases with increased territory, by fresh bodies of military colonists. Dio Cassius gives some additional information. (*a*) The colonists were exclusively his own veteran soldiers: τοῖς μὲν ἄλλοις (those still retained on service) χρήματα ἔδωκε, τοῖς δὲ διὰ παντὸς αὐτῷ συστρατεύσασι καὶ γῆν προσκατένειμε. (*b*) Some of the dispossessed occupants of land were compensated by being sent out as colonists to Dyrrachium, Philippi, and other places. These were of course not military colonies, but they no doubt explain the words *aut in provinciis* of Hyginus. (*c*) Where this was not done, the communities were paid for the land made use of: τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς ἀργύριον ἀντὶ τῆς χώρας τὸ μὲν ἔνειμε τὸ δ' ὑπέσχετο. This pecuniary reimbursement would naturally not apply to the towns dispossessed for favouring Antony. In another passage of the *Monumentum* (V. 36) Augustus speaks of twenty-eight Italian colonies as most flourishing and populous.

The sum, 600,000,000 sesterces, stated to have been spent on buying Italian land seems very large, but it almost certainly covered the payment made for the lands at Dyrrachium, Philippi, &c. (really the price of the Italian land set free), and it may even have included the money paid to the troops still serving. Dio tells us that the money was supplied, partly from the spoils of victory, partly from the revenues of Egypt.

The assignation of land to soldiers in 14 B.C. is to be connected, though Augustus does not say so explicitly, with the purchase of provincial lands. It was about the time of personal visits to both Spain and Gaul, and it was also the time when a large number of the soldiers retained after Actium may

probably have completed twenty years' service. Augustus himself enumerates the provinces in which he planted colonies of veterans (V. 35, &c.). Among these Gallia Narbonensis and Spain hold a prominent place, and though they need not all have dated from exactly the same year, Dio Cassius nevertheless declares, speaking of 14 B. C., τότε δὲ πόλεις ἔν τε τῇ Γαλατίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἰβερίᾳ συχνὰς ἀπῴκισε (54. 23). If the Italian colonization of 30 B. C. disposed of 120,000, there are still 180,000 to be accounted for out of the number specified by Augustus. To judge by the amount of money expended in 14 B. C., as compared with the money payments made after 7 B. C., the number of provincial colonists must have been well over 100,000. We have no confirmation of the claim that the land was paid for. If it was, the precedent was almost certainly not followed on later occasions. The Greek version gives the sums of money in *drachmae*. Augustus may be justified in saying that he was the first to pay for lands required for colonies in the provinces, but the principle of land purchase was the main characteristic of the Rullan proposal, and there can be no doubt that it was carried into practice by Caesar, if not in his agrarian laws of 59 B. C., at any rate in the dictatorship. Appian (*B. C.* 2. 94) makes him promise: δώσω δὲ καὶ γῆν ἅπασιν ἐκτελεσθέντων τῶν πολέμων, οὐ καθάπερ Σύλλας, ἀφαιρούμενος ἑτέρων ἣν ἔχουσι καὶ . . . συνοικίζων, . . . ἀλλὰ τὴν τοῦ δήμου γῆν ἐπινέμων καὶ τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ, καὶ τὰ δέοντα προσωνούμενος.

III. 28–33. *Et postea Ti. Nerone et Cn. Pisone consulibus, itemque C. Antistio et D. Laelio cos. et C. Calvisio et L. Pasieno consulibus, et L. Lentulo et M. Messalla consulibus, et L. Caninio et Q. Fabricio cos. militibus, quos emeritis stipendis in sua municipia remisi, praemia numerato persolvi, quam in rem sestertium quater millens libenter impendi.*

9. 4–11. Καὶ μετέπειτα Τιβερίῳ Νέρωνι καὶ Ναίῳ

Πείσωνι ὑπάτοις καὶ πάλιν Γαΐῳ Ἀνθεστίῳ καὶ Δέκμῳ Λαιλίῳ ὑπάτοις καὶ Γαΐῳ Καλουισίῳ καὶ Λευκίῳ Πασσιήνῳ ὑπάτοις καὶ Λευκίῳ Λέντλῳ καὶ Μάρκῳ Μεσσάλᾳ ὑπάτοις καὶ Λευκίῳ Κανινίῳ καὶ Κοίντῳ Φαβρικίῳ ὑπάτοις, στρατιώταις ἀπολυομένοις, οὓς κατήγαγον εἰς τὰς ἰδίας πόλεις, φιλανθρώπου ὀνόματι ἔδωκα μυριάδας ἐγγὺς μυρίας.

And afterwards in the consulship of Ti. Nero and Cn. Piso, and of C. Antistius and D. Laelius, and of C. Calvisius and L. Pasienus, and of L. Lentulus and M. Messalla, and of L. Caninius and Q. Fabricius, I bestowed rewards in money to the soldiers, whom after the completion of their service I sent back to their own municipia. And for this purpose with ungrudging liberality I expended about four hundred million sesterces.

After the considerable colonial assignations of 14 B. C. Augustus changed his policy with regard to discharged soldiers, and in 13 B. C., according to Dio Cassius 54. 25 *διέταξε τά τε ἔτη ὅσα οἱ πολῖται στρατεύσοιντο καὶ τὰ χρήματα ὅσα παυσάμενοι τῆς στρατείας, ἀντὶ τῆς χώρας ἣν ἀεί ποτε ᾔτουν, λήψοιντο.* The length of service was now to be sixteen years, and at the end of that time the *honesta missio* was to be accompanied not by the grant of land, but by a fixed money payment. Almost immediately after this began the continuous German campaigns of Drusus and Tiberius, so that the working of the new scheme was probably postponed, but in the years 7, 6, 4, 3, and 2 B. C. many discharged legionaries were sent back to their *municipia* or domiciles, whether in Italy or the provinces, each with the sum of money previously fixed. If we knew what that sum was, we could calculate the number of soldiers among whom in the five years mentioned 400,000,000 sesterces were divided. We only know that in A. D. 6 the retiring allowance was made 12,000 sesterces, *τρισχιλίαι δραχμαί* (Dio Cass. 55. 23), probably an advance on that previously received. On the supposition

that in 13 B.C. it was fixed at 6,000 sesterces, about 66,000 would have been provided for. In any case, the *trecenta millia* spoken of by Augustus (I. 22) as discharged and provided for, would have to include the cases, perhaps not very numerous, of soldiers discharged under the new scheme of A. D. 6.

CAP. XVII

III. 34–35. *Quater pecunia mea iuvi aerarium, ita ut sestertium milliens et quingentiens ad eos qui praerant aerario detulerim.*

9. 12–14. Τετράκις χρήμασιν ἐμοῖς ἀνέλαβον τὸ αἰράριον, εἰς ὃ κατήνενκα χειλίας ἑπτακοσίας πεντήκοντα μυριάδας.

Four times I helped the aerarium with my own money, paying over to the officials in charge of the treasury one hundred and fifty million sesterces.

The charge of and responsibility for the *aerarium Saturni* fell in theory to the senate after the restoration of the republic in 28 and 27 B. C. It is possible that, on the same theory, all public revenues from the *provinciae Caesaris* were due to the *aerarium*, but were administered by the emperor according to the republican precedent, by which an *imperator* rendered his financial accounts to the senate only on laying down his *imperium*. At any rate the phrase *pecunia mea*, as distinct from *patrimonium meum* in the next paragraph, implies on the one hand that Augustus, apart from his *patrimonium*, controlled large financial resources, and on the other that they were not yet regarded as belonging to an organized and central *fiscus*. During the principate of Augustus the presidents of the *aerarium* could only be vaguely described, as their titles were changed more than once. Up to 28 B. C. the *quaestores urbani* retained their old functions. Then Augustus allowed the senate to select annually two *praefecti* of praetorian rank.

As this led to keen and sometimes dishonest competition for a lucrative post, in 23 B.C. the charge was made to devolve on two of the praetors of each year, selected by lot, and though incompetent administrators must often have resulted from this method, it remained in force till Claudius changed it. (See an account of the changes in *Ann.* 13. 29.)

The fact of these four subventions does not in itself support the suggestion that the *aerarium* was in a chronic state of insolvency, if we may judge from the two cases out of the four which are alone on record. In 28 B.C., as the public funds were inadequate to the extraordinary expenses attending the games to celebrate the victory at Actium, Augustus borrowed money and paid it into the *aerarium*: ὁ δ' οὖν Καῖσαρ ἔς τε τὰς θεωρίας ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων δῆθεν ἀνήλισκε, καὶ ἐπειδὴ χρημάτων τῷ δημοσίῳ ἐδέησεν, ἐδανείσατό τινα καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ (Dio Cass. 53. 2). For the second case in 16 B.C. Mommsen cites a medal (Eckhel, 7, 105): *senatus populusque Romanus imperatori Caesari quod viae munitae sunt ex ea pecunia quam is ad aerarium detulit.*

Somewhat different from these grants to the *aerarium* for special or extraordinary purposes are those recorded by Tacitus under Tiberius (*Ann.* 2. 47, and 4, 13,), when the provincial tribute is remitted for special reasons to certain cities of Asia and Achaia for five and three years respectively. It is probable that on these occasions the *princeps* himself made up the amount to the *aerarium*, as Augustus certainly did on a smaller scale in 12 B.C. in a case recorded by Dio (see below on III. 40–3). When we hear that under Nero *sestertium quadringentiens aerario inlatum est ad retinendam populi fidem* (*Ann.* 13. 31), and when Nero affirms *se annuum sexcenties sestertium rei publicae largiri* (15. 18) it is fair to infer something like chronic insolvency.

III. 35–39. *Et M. Lepido et L. Arruntio consulibus in aerarium militare quod ex consilio meo constitutum est,*

ex quo praemia darentur militibus, qui vicena aut plura stipendia emeruissent, HS. milliens et septingentiens ex patrimonio meo detuli.

9. 14–20. Καὶ Μάρκῳ Λεπίδῳ καὶ Λευκίῳ Ἀρρουντίῳ ὑπάτοις εἰς τὸ στρατιωτικὸν αἰράριον, ὃ τῇ ἐμῇ γνώμῃ κατέστη, ἵνα ἐξ αὐτοῦ αἱ δωρεαὶ εἰσέπειτα τοῖς ἐμοῖς στρατιώταις δίδωνται, οἳ εἴκοσιν ἐνιαυτοὺς ἢ πλείονας ἐστρατεύσαντο, μυριάδας τετράκις χειλίας διακοσίας πεντήκοντα ἐκ τῆς ἐμῆς ὑπάρξεως κατήνενκα.

In the consulship of M. Lepidus and L. Arruntius I paid over out of my own patrimonium one hundred and seventy million sesterces into the military aerarium, which was established in accordance with my design of providing rewards for my soldiers on the completion of twenty or more years of service.

This is a sequel to the statements made in III. 28 foll. with regard to soldiers rewarded in 7, 6, 4, 3, and 2 B.C. in accordance with the arrangements assigned by Dio Cassius to the year 13 B.C. (see above, Dio Cass. 54. 25). In spite, however, of the discharge with rewards of a certain number of soldiers in the years mentioned, the pressure of the German and Pannonian wars had impeded the working of the scheme, and we learn from Dio (55. 23) that in A.D. 5 there were complaints both as to the smallness of the retiring allowance and the uncertainty as to the length of service. Augustus thereupon gave out τοῖς μὲν ἐκ τοῦ δορυφορικοῦ πεντακισχιλίας δραχμάς, ἐπειδὰν ἑκκαίδεκα ἔτη, τοῖς δὲ ἑτέροις τρισχιλίας, ἐπειδὰν εἴκοσι στρατεύσωνται, δίδοσθαι. He then consulted the senate as to how the funds necessary for fulfilling these promises were to be found, and meanwhile, in A.D. 6, ἐσήνεγκεν ὁ Αὔγουστος χρήματα καὶ ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ Τιβερίου ἐς τὸ ταμιεῖον, ὃ καὶ στρατιωτικὸν ἐπωνόμασε (55. 25). This money, as he tells us, was 170,000,000 sesterces, and came from his *patrimonium*. The words *vicena*

aut plura stipendia seem to exclude the praetorians, who must also have looked to the *aerarium militare* for their pensions, but no doubt the immediate cause of its establishment was the discontent of the legions. As to its future maintenance, Dio says that in addition to promising his own annual subvention, he received similar promises παρὰ βασιλέων δήμων τέ τινων, and definitely applied the *vicesima hereditatum* to the upkeep of the *aerarium*, which was placed under the management of two ex-praetors appointed by lot and holding office for three years. It appears from Tacitus, *Ann.* 1. 78, that the *centesima rerum venalium* was applied to the same purpose. Suetonius (*Aug.* 49) puts the matter shortly: *utque perpetuo et sine difficultate sumptus ad eos* (*milites*) *tuendos . . . suppeterent, aerarium militare cum vectigalibus novis constituit.* Unfortunately the great Pannonian rebellion, followed by renewed wars in Germany, prevented this scheme of *honesta missio* after a specified period of service with an adequate pension allowance from being worked out, and the result of the failure was seen in the Pannonian and German mutinies after the accession of Tiberius.

CAP. XVIII

III. 40–43. *Inde ab eo anno, quo Cn. et P. Lentuli consules fuerunt, cum deficerent vectigalia, tum centum millibus hominum tum pluribus inlato frumento vel ad nummarios tributus ex agro et patrimonio meo opem tuli.*

9. 21–24. Ἀπ' ἐκείνου τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ, ἐφ' οὗ Ναῖος καὶ Πόπλιος Λέντλοι ὕπατοι ἐγένοντο, ὅτε ὑπέλειπον αἱ δημόσιαι πρόσοδοι, ἄλλοτε μὲν δέκα μυριάσιν, ἄλλοτε δὲ πλείοσιν σειτικὰς καὶ ἀργυρικὰς συντάξεις ἐκ τῆς ἐμῆς ὑπάρξεως ἔδωκα.

From the year in which Cn. and P. Lentulus were consuls, whenever the provincial vectigalia fell short, I came

to the relief of the possessores, numbering sometimes one hundred thousand, sometime smore, and made up their corn quota by contributions from my own land, or their money tribute from my patrimonium.

The clue to the general meaning of this statement is found in a passage of Dio under the year 12 B. C. (54. 30) ἐπειδή τε ἡ Ἀσία τὸ ἔθνος ἐπικουρίας τινὸς διὰ σεισμοὺς μάλιστα ἐδεῖτο, τόν τε φόρον αὐτῆς τὸν ἔτειον ἐκ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ χρημάτων τῷ κοινῷ ἐσήνεγκε. This means that, when Asia was unable to pay its full tribute, Augustus made up the shortage to the *aerarium* out of his own money.

It is impossible, however, to take the statement literally, and to suppose that Augustus paid the whole tribute of the province. He can merely have made up the shortage in those districts affected by the earthquakes, and it can hardly be doubted that this was one of the occasions referred to by Augustus himself. Why the year 19 B. C. is taken as a *terminus post quem*, why the years in which relief was given are not specified, and why the numbers of the relieved are vaguely stated rather than the amounts due to his own liberality are given, must remain matters of pure conjecture. The statement comes in appropriately enough at this point. The two previous paragraphs had given the sums paid directly into the two treasuries; this one alludes to indirect subventions, made to supply special and temporary deficiencies. The different methods of relief implied by *frumento inlato* and *ad nummarios tributus* is well illustrated by Mommsen's two citations from Tacitus. (a) *Ann.* 4. 6 *frumenta et pecuniae vectigales et cetera publicorum fructuum societatibus equitum Romanorum agitabantur;* (b) id. *Agric.* 31 *bona fortunaeque in tributum, ager et annus in frumentum.* The provincial *tributum* was sometimes paid in money, sometimes in grain, and Augustus relieved both classes of *possessores.* The Greek expression σειτικὰς καὶ ἀργυρικὰς συντάξεις is more explicit than the Latin

version. As already pointed out, the remissions of tribute by Tiberius for five years to Asia and three years to Achaia were probably analogous acts of liberality.

CAP. XIX

IV. 1–8. *Curiam et continens ei Chalcidicum, templumque Apollinis in Palatio cum porticibus, aedem divi Iuli, Lupercal, porticum ad circum Flaminium, quam sum appellari passus ex nomine eius, qui priorem eodem in solo fecerat Octaviam, pulvinar ad circum maximum, aedes in Capitolio Iovis Feretri et Iovis Tonantis, aedem Quirini, aedes Minervae et Iunonis Reginae et Iovis Libertatis in Aventino, aedem Larum in summa sacra via, aedem deum Penatium in Velia, aedem Iuventatis, aedem Matris Magnae in Palatio feci.*

10. 2–13. Βουλευτήριον καὶ τὸ πλησίον αὐτῷ Χαλκιδικόν, ναόν τε Ἀπόλλωνος ἐν Παλατίῳ σὺν στοαῖς, ναὸν θεοῦ Ἰουλίου, Πανὸς ἱερόν, στοὰν πρὸς ἱπποδρόμῳ τῷ προσαγορευομένῳ Φλαμινίῳ, ἣν εἴασα προσαγορεύεσθαι ἐξ ὀνόματος ἐκείνου Ὀκταουΐαν, ὃς πρῶτος αὐτὴν ἀνέστησεν, ναὸν πρὸς τῷ μεγάλῳ ἱπποδρόμῳ, ναοὺς ἐν Καπιτωλίῳ Διὸς Τροπαιοφόρου καὶ Διὸς Βροντησίου, ναὸν Κυρείνου, ναοὺς Ἀθηνᾶς καὶ Ἥρας Βασιλίδος καὶ Διὸς Ἐλευθερίου ἐν Ἀουεντίνῳ, ἡρώων πρὸς τῇ ἱερᾷ ὁδῷ, θεῶν κατοικιδίων ἐν Οὐελίᾳ, ναὸν Νεότητος, ναὸν μητρὸς θεῶν ἐν Παλατίῳ ἐπόησα.

The following buildings were constructed by me; the senate house and the adjoining shrine of Minerva Chalcidice, the temple of Apollo on the Palatine with its porticoes, the temple of the deified Julius, a Lupercal, the portico at the circus Flaminius, which I allowed to be

called Octavia after the builder of an older portico on the same site, a shrine at the Circus Maximus, the temples of Jupiter Feretrius and Jupiter Tonans on the Capitol, the temple of Quirinus, the temples of Minerva and Juno Regina and of Jupiter Libertas on the Aventine, the temple of the Lares at the head of the Via Sacra, the temple of the dei Penates in the Velia, the temple of Juventus and the temple of the Magna Mater on the Palatine.

The buildings enumerated in this list were all either entirely new constructions or reconstructions of edifices recently destroyed. Examples of the former are the temples of Apollo and of Julius, of the latter the *curia* and the *porticus Octavia*. The buildings are given in the time order of their completion, and in almost every case are mentioned by some historian.

1 and 2. The *curia Iulia* was decreed in 42 B. C. (Dio Cass. 47. 19), and was dedicated, together with the shrine of Minerva, in 29 B. C.: *τό τε Ἀθήναιον τὸ Χαλκιδικὸν ὠρομασμένον καὶ τὸ βουλευτήριον τὸ Ἰουλίειον τὸ ἐπὶ τῇ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ τιμῇ γενόμενον, καθιέρωσεν* (id. 51. 22).

3. The temple of Apollo was begun in 36 B. C. to commemorate the victory over Sex. Pompeius (Dio Cass. 49. 15; Vell. 2. 81). Suetonius (*Aug.* 29) mentions the temple and says, *addidit porticus cum bibliotheca Latina Graecaque.* Dio says that the site, originally intended for his own house, having been struck by lightning, was consecrated to Apollo by Julius Caesar.

4. The temple of Iulius decreed in 42 B. C. (Dio Cass. 47. 18) was dedicated in 29 B. C. (id. 51. 22). It was built on the spot where the body of the dictator was cremated.

5. The *porticus Octavia*, near the theatre of Pompey (Mommsen cites Festus, p. 178), is to be distinguished from another *porticus Octavia*, built by the sister of Augustus. The former was built by Cn. Octavius, the conqueror of Perseus of Macedonia, in 165 B. C. It was in existence in 33 B. C., as

Octavian deposited in it some trophies from the Dalmatian campaigns (App. *Illyr.* 28).

6. The *circus maximus* was destroyed by fire in 31 B. C. (Dio Cass. 50. 10), and with it a shrine which Dio calls ναὸν Ἐλπίδος. Suetonius (*Aug.* 45) says that the emperor sometimes viewed the racing in the circus *ex pulvinari.*

7. Livy (4. 20), speaking of Augustus as *templorum omnium conditorem aut restitutorem*, specifies the temple of Jupiter Feretrius *quam vetustate dilapsam refecit.*

8. Suetonius (*Aug.* 29) says that Augustus vowed a temple to Jupiter Tonans at the time of the expedition against the Cantabri (in 26 or 25 B. C.) in consequence of a fatality from lightning to one of his retinue. It was dedicated in 22 B. C.

9. The temple of Quirinus was another reconstruction. Dio (54. 19) states that Augustus rededicated it in 16 B. C., ἐκ καινῆς οἰκοδομήσας.

10–12. There is no record as to the reconstruction of the three temples on the Aventine, nor indeed of their original foundation, except that the temple to Juno Regina was vowed by Camillus after the capture of Veii.

13. It is a question whether an inscription in *C. I. L.* vi. 456 refers to the temple of the Lares or not. The inscription runs: *Laribus publicis sacrum imp. Caesar Augustus pontifex maximus trib. pot. XIX ex stipe, quam populus ei contulit k. Ianuariis apsenti C. Calvisio Sabino L. Passieno Rufo cos.* This was in 4 B. C., and Suetonius (*Aug.* 57) speaks of the dedication of certain temples on the kalends of January Mommsen, however, cites *C. I. L.* vi. 454 as proving that the *magistri vicorum* who superintended the worship of the Lares were instituted as early as 7 B. C. The point does not seem conclusive, but may be left open.

14. No other statement is on record as to the erection of the temple of the Penates.

15 and 16. It happens that the temples of Juventus and of the Idaean Magna Mater were dedicated in the same year

191 B.C. (Liv. 36. 36). Dio records the destruction by fire of the former in 54. 19.

CAP. XX

IV. 9–10. *Capitolium et Pompeium theatrum utrumque opus impensa grandi refeci sine ulla inscriptione nominis mei.*

10. 14–16. Καπιτώλιον καὶ τὸ Πομπηίου θέατρον ἑκάτερον τὸ ἔργον ἀναλώμασιν μεγίστοις ἐπεσκεύασα ἄνευ ἐπιγραφῆς τοῦ ἐμοῦ ὀνόματος.

The Capitoline temple and the theatre of Pompeius I repaired with enormous outlay on both works, and without having my name inscribed on either.

There is no record of either the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus or the theatre of Pompey having been restored by Augustus, except the words in an inscription, detected by Mommsen (*C. I. L.* vi. 9404), *theatrum Augustum Pompeianum*, which might possibly refer to the latter.

IV. 10–11. *Rivos aquarum compluribus locis vetustate labentes refeci,*

10. 16–17. Ἀγωγοὺς ὑδάτων ἐν πλείστοις τόποις τῇ παλαιότητι ὀλισθάνοντας ἐπεσκεύασα,

I repaired the channels of the aqueducts which were in many places falling into decay through lapse of time,

The promise of Augustus to do this is mentioned by Frontinus (*de Aquaeductibus*, c. 125): *De rivis specubus fornicibusque aquae Iuliae, Marciae, Appiae, Tepulae, Anionis reficiendis . . . quos Augustus Caesar se refecturum impensa sua senatui pollicitus est.* That the promise was fulfilled in 5–4 B.C., is shown by the inscription on the Porta Tiburtina: *Imp. Caesar divi Iuli f. Augustus p. m. cos. XII tribun. potest. XIX imp. XIV*

rivos aquarum omnium refecit (*C. I. L.* vi. 1244). Augustus had undertaken the *cura aquarum* after the death of Agrippa in 12 B. C., but all work carried out under the obligations of that *cura* would be at the public expense. This being performed *impensa sua*, was a work of supererogation, and, as such, properly included in the Monument.

IV. 11–12. *et aquam, quae Marcia appellatur duplicavi fonte novo in rivum eius immisso.*

10. 18–19. καὶ ὕδωρ τὸ καλούμενον Μάρκιον ἐδίπλωσα, πηγὴν νέαν εἰς τὸ ῥεῖθρον αὐτοῦ ἐποχετεύσας.

and in the aqueduct known as Marcia I doubled the supply of water by turning a new spring into its channel.

The fact is recorded by Frontinus, c. 12: *Augustus in supplementum Marciae, quod in siccitate egeret auxilio, aliam eiusdem bonitatis opere subterraneo perduxit usque ad Marciae rivum, quae ab inventore appellatur Augusta.*

The *aqua Marcia*, the course of which, about thirty-six miles, was mainly underground, and which supplied Rome with its purest water, was constructed in 144 B. C. by Q. Marcius Rex.

IV. 12–16. *Forum Iulium, et basilicam quae fuit inter aedem Castoris et aedem Saturni, coepta profligataque opera a patre meo perfeci et eandem basilicam consumptam incendio ampliato eius solo sub titulo nominis filiorum meorum incohavi et, si vivus non perfecissem, perfici ab heredibus iussi.*

10. 20–24—11. 1–3. Ἀγορὰν Ἰουλίαν καὶ βασιλικὴν τὴν μεταξὺ τοῦ τε ναοῦ τῶν Διοσκόρων καὶ Κρόνου καταβεβλημένα ἔργα ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου ἐτελείωσα καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν βασιλικὴν καυθεῖσαν ἐπὶ αὐξηθέντι ἐδάφει αὐτῆς ἐξ ἐπιγραφῆς ὀνόματος τῶν ἐμῶν υἱῶν ὑπηρξάμην, καὶ εἰ μὴ αὐτὸς τετελειώκοιμι, τελειωθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν ἐμῶν κληρονόμων ἐπέταξα.

I completed the Forum Julium, and the basilica which stood between the temple of Castor and the temple of Saturn, works begun and almost finished by my father, and, when the same basilica was destroyed by fire, I commenced its rebuilding on an enlarged site, to be inscribed with the names of my sons; and in case I should not live to complete it, I ordered the work to be finished by my heirs.

The *forum Iulium* together with the temple of Venus Genetrix were dedicated, though still unfinished, by Caesar in 46 B. C. (Dio Cass. 43. 22). The original *basilica Iulia*, dedicated at the same time as the forum, was destroyed by fire. Augustus rebuilt it with the addition of a *porticus*, and, as we should infer from his own words, and also from Suetonius and Dio, he intended to call it the *basilica Gaii et Lucii*: *Quaedam etiam opera sub nomine alieno, nepotum scilicet . . . fecit, ut porticum basilicamque Gaii et Lucii* (*Aug.* 29). Dio (56. 27) says under the year A. D. 12: ἡ στοὰ ἡ Λιουία καλουμένη ᾠκοδομήθη ἐς τιμὴν τοῦ τε Γαΐου καὶ τοῦ Λουκίου τῶν Καισάρων. But, as the *porticus* only was dedicated in this year, and the *basilica* was still unfinished, Augustus charged his heirs with its completion, and the *basilica* was known, like its predecessor, as the *basilica Iulia*. It is noticeable that Augustus uses the word *profligata* in the sense of 'nearly finished', a sense which Aulus Gellius recognizes as not uncommon, but condemns as bad Latinity. The Greek version misunderstands the meaning.

IV. 17–18. *Duo et octoginta templa deum in urbe consul sextum ex decreto senatus refeci, nullo praetermisso quod eo tempore refici debebat.*

11. 3–6. *Δύο καὶ ὀγδοήκοντα ναοὺς ἐν τῇ πόλει ἕκτον ὕπατος δόγματι συνκλήτου ἐπεσκεύασα οὐδένα περιλιπών, ὃς ἐκείνῳ τῷ χρόνῳ ἐπισκευῆς ἐδεῖτο.*

In my sixth consulship I repaired eighty and two temples of the gods in the city, in accordance with a decree of the senate, omitting none which at that time needed repair.

Suetonius (*Aug.* 30) has a vaguer statement, not confined to any particular year; *aedes sacras vetustate conlapsas aut incendio absumptas refecit*, while Horace (*Od.* 3. 6) refers to the same thing: *donec templa refeceris aedesque labentes deorum et foeda nigro simulacra fumo.* Cf. also Dio 53. 2 τῶν ναῶν πρόνοιαν ἐποιήσατο κτλ., from which it appears that, where temples had been built by individuals, the restoration was imposed on their descendants, Augustus himself undertaking the rest.

IV. 19–20. *Consul septimum viam Flaminiam ab urbe Ariminum feci et pontes omnes praeter Mulvium et Minucium.*

11. 6–9. Ὕπατος ἕβδομον ὁδὸν Φλαμινίαν ἀπὸ Ῥώμης Ἀρίμινον γεφύρας τε τὰς ἐν αὐτῇ πάσας ἔξω δυεῖν τῶν μὴ ἐπιδεομένων ἐπισκευῆς ἐπόησα.

In my seventh consulship I remade the Via Flaminia from the city as far as Ariminum and also all the bridges with the exception of the Mulvian and Minucian.

This, like the previous statement, proves the activity of Octavian in the years immediately following Actium. In this case, too, the work taken in hand was carried out in co-operation with others, though Augustus records only his own share in it. Suetonius makes this clear (*Aug.* 30): *Desumpta sibi Flaminia via Arimino tenus munienda, reliquas triumphalibus viris ex manubiali pecunia sternendas distribuit.* Augustus was himself fresh from his triple triumph in 29 B.C., and we know of at least one of the *triumphales viri*. C. Calvisius Sabinus, who had celebrated a triumph in 28 B.C. for victories in Spain, had the repair of the *via Latina* entrusted to him, as we know from *C.I.L.* x. 6895. Dio (53. 22) bears similar

testimony: Ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῷ προειρημένῳ ἔτει, τὰς ὁδοὺς τὰς ἔξω τοῦ τείχους δυσπορεύτους ὑπ' ἀμελείας ὁρῶν οὔσας, τὰς μὲν ἄλλας ἄλλοις τισὶ τῶν βουλευτῶν ἐπισκευάσαι τοῖς οἰκείοις τέλεσι προσέταξε, τῆς δὲ δὴ Φλαμινίας αὐτός, ἐπειδήπερ ἐκστρατεύσειν δι' αὐτῆς ἔμελλεν, ἐπεμελήθη. Lastly, to crown this corroborative evidence, we have the inscription on the triumphal arch at Ariminum (*C. I. L.* xi. 365): *Senatus populusque Romanus imp. Caesari divi f. Augusto, cos. VII, imp. VII, designat. octavom, via Flaminia et reliqeis celeberrimeis Italiae vieis consilio et sumptibus eius muniteis.* The *cura viarum* was not definitely taken over by Augustus till 11 B. C., the *cura operum publicorum* not till a later but uncertain date (Suet. *Aug.* 37).

CAP. XXI

IV. 21–22. *In privato solo Martis Vltoris templum forumque Augustum ex manibiis feci.*

11. 10–11. Ἐν ἰδιωτικῷ ἐδάφει Ἄρεως Ἀμύντορος ἀγοράν τε Σεβαστὴν ἐκ λαφύρων ἐπόησα.

On private ground and with the spoils of war I built the temple of Mars Ultor and the forum Augusti.

Suetonius (*Aug.* 29) gives us useful information about both constructions: *Publica opera plurima exstruxit, e quibus vel praecipua: forum cum aede Martis Vltoris . . . fori exstruendi causa fuit hominum et iudiciorum multitudo, quae videbatur non sufficientibus duobus etiam tertio indigere. . . . Aedem Martis bello Philippensi, pro ultione paterna suscepto, voverat; sanxit ergo, ut de bellis triumphisque hic consuleretur senatus, provincias cum imperio petituri hinc deducerentur, quique victores redissent, huc insignia triumphorum conferrent.* The site was private ground, because Augustus bought it himself from the former owners with the spoils gained after Philippi. As we know from Suetonius (*Aug.* 56), as well as from the excavated area of the forum, Augustus was not able to make it perfectly symmetrical:

Forum angustius fecit, non ausus extorquere possessoribus proximas domos. The temple of Mars Ultor was not actually dedicated till 2 B.C. (Vell. ii. 100), but according to Dio (54. 8) the Roman eagles recovered from Phraates in 20 B.C. were deposited in it.

IV. 22–23. *Theatrum ad aede Apollinis in solo magna ex parte a privatis empto feci, quod sub nomine M. Marcelli generi mei esset.*

11. 11–14. Θέατρον πρὸς τῷ Ἀπόλλωνος ναῷ ἐπὶ ἐδάφους ἐκ πλείστου μέρους ἀγορασθέντος ἀνήγειρα, ἐπὶ ὀνόματος Μαρκέλλου τοῦ γαμβροῦ μου.

The theatre adjoining the temple of Apollo I built on ground for the most part bought from private owners. This was to be inscribed with the name of my son-in-law M. Marcellus.

This temple was commenced by Caesar. Suetonius (*Iul.* 44) speaks of it as *theatrum summae magnitudinis Tarpeio monti accubans.* He left it, however, uncompleted (Dio Cass. 43. 49). Augustus finished it, and in 11 B.C. (Plin. *N. H.* 8. 17. 65) or in 13 B.C. (Dio Cass. 54. 26) dedicated it in the name of Marcellus, son of Octavia, who had married Julia, but died in 23 B.C.

IV. 23–26. *Dona ex manibiis in Capitolio et in aede divi Iuli et in aede Apollinis et in aede Vestae et in templo Martis Vltoris consacravi, quae mihi constiterunt* $\overline{HS}$. *circiter milliens.*

11. 14–17. Ἀναθέματα ἐκ λαφύρων ἐν Καπιτωλίῳ καὶ ναῷ Ἰουλίῳ καὶ ναῷ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Ἑστίας καὶ Ἄρεως ἀφιέρωσα, ἃ ἐμοὶ κατέστη ἐνγὺς μυριάδων δισχειλίων πεντακοσίων.

In the Capitoline temple and in the temple of the deified Julius and in the temples of Apollo and Vesta and Mars

Ultor I consecrated gifts out of the spoils of war to the value of one hundred million sesterces.

Suetonius (*Aug.* 30) declares: *Aedes sacras . . . opulentissimis donis adornavit, ut qui in cellam Capitolini Iovis sedecim millia pondo auri gemmasque ac margaritas quingenties sestertii una donatione contulerit.* As on this showing the donation to this single temple exceeded by 14,000,000 sesterces what, according to the calculation of Augustus, was the total contributed to five temples, it must be regarded with suspicion, as must also the statement of Dio (51. 22) that gifts were made to the temples of Juno and Minerva.

IV. 26–30. *Auri coronari pondo triginta et quinque millia municipiis et colonis Italiae conferentibus ad triumphos meos quintum consul remisi, et postea, quotienscumque imperator appellatus sum, aurum coronarium non accepi decernentibus municipiis et colonis aeque benigne adque antea decreverant.*

11. 18–24. *Εἰς χρυσοῦν στέφανον λειτρῶν τρισμυρίων πεντακισχειλίων καταφερούσαις ταῖς ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ πολειτείαις καὶ ἀποικίαις συνεχώρησα τὸ πέμπτον ὑπατεύων, καὶ ὕστερον, ὁσάκις αὐτοκράτωρ προσηγορεύθην, τὰς εἰς τὸν στέφανον ἐπαγγελίας οὐκ ἔλαβον ψηφιζομένων τῶν πολειτειῶν καὶ ἀποικιῶν μετὰ τῆς αὐτῆς προθυμίας καθάπερ ἐψηφίσαντο πρότερον.*

In my fifth consulship I remitted five-and-thirty thousand pounds of gold, which under the head of 'aurum coronarium' the municipia and coloniae of Italy contributed to my triumphs. Afterwards, moreover, on the occasions when I was saluted imperator, I refused to accept the aurum coronarium, though the municipia and coloniae decreed it with the same enthusiasm as before.

When under the republic a triumph was decreed to a

victorious general, the communities of his province were expected to present him with gold crowns to be displayed in his procession. As these crowns or their value were often extorted by governors, who had no claim to a triumph, it was provided by a *lex Iulia* of 59 B.C. that no crowns should be voted before the triumph was decreed (Cic. *in Pis.* 37. 90). Though it was not absolutely unknown for Italian cities to follow the same custom, a new departure was made, when under the triumvirate in 41 B.C., L. Antonius received crowns *παρὰ τοῦ δήμου κατὰ φυλήν, ὃ μηδενὶ τῶν προτέρων ἐγεγόνει* (Dio Cass. 48. 4). It was apparently against this new precedent that Augustus in connexion with his triumphs in 29 B.C. set his face, once more limiting the presentation of gold crowns to provincial communities. That what he refused was a contribution made *κατὰ φυλήν*, as in the case of L. Antonius, is acutely inferred by Mommsen from the amount remitted, thirty-five thousand pounds of gold, or one thousand from each of the thirty-five tribes. Dio Cassius (51. 21) says without comment under the year 26 B.C.: *παρὰ τῶν πόλεων τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ τὸ χρυσίον τὸ τοῖς στεφάνοις προσῆκον οὐκ ἐδέξατο.* Apparently the Italian cities were not easily to be denied in the matter, for Augustus implies that they were eager to vote the crowns, not only on the occasion of a triumph, but at each imperial salutation. On the phrase *municipia et coloniae*, now an exhaustive classification of Italian towns, see a discussion in the *Classical Quarterly*, between the late Mr. H. J. Cunningham and myself (*Classical Quarterly*, 1914, April and October; 1915, January).

CAP. XXII

IV. 31–33. *Ter munus gladiatorium dedi meo nomine et quinquens filiorum meorum aut nepotum nomine; quibus muneribus depugnaverunt hominum circiter decem millia.*

12. 2–4. *Τρὶς μονομαχίαν ἔδωκα τῷ ἐμῷ ὀνόματι καὶ*

πεντάκις τῶν υἱῶν μου ἢ υἱωνῶν· ἐν αἷς μονομαχίαις ἐμαχέσαντο ἐνγὺς μύριοι.

Three times I gave a gladiatorial show in my own name, and five times in the names of my sons and grandsons; at these shows about ten thousand men fought in the arena.

Of the shows certainly given by Augustus himself Dio records (1) those given at the dedication of the *templum divi Iuli* in 29 B.C. (51. 2 2); (2) those celebrated in 29 B.C. to commemorate the victory at Actium (53. 1); (3) those given in 2 B.C., when the temple of Mars Ultor was dedicated. Of shows given through or in the name of members of the imperial family we have: (1) those given in 16 B.C. in accordance with a decree of the senate through Tiberius and Drusus (54. 19); (2) those in 12 B.C. given in the names of Gaius and Lucius Caesar (54. 28 and 29); (3) those given in A.D. 6 in honour of the elder Drusus by his sons Germanicus and Claudius, the former being adopted grandson of Augustus (55. 27). There remain two doubtful cases: (1) when shows were given in 7 B.C. as a sequel to the funeral of Agrippa, which may have been, like those of five years earlier, in the names of his two sons. (2) An incident is mentioned by Suetonius (*Aug.* 43) as a *nepotum suorum munus*, which may or may not have been one of those recorded by Dio, since the biographer gives no indication of date.

IV. 33–35. *Bis athletarum undique accitorum spectaculum populo praebui meo nomine et tertium nepotis mei nomine.*

12. 4–7. Δὶς ἀθλητῶν πανταχόθεν μεταπεμφθέντων γυμνικοῦ ἀγῶνος θέαν τῷ δήμῳ παρέσχον τῷ ἐμῷ ὀνόματι, καὶ τρίτον τοῦ υἱωνοῦ μου.

Twice I provided for the people in my own name an

exhibition of athletes collected from all quarters, and a third time in the name of my grandson.

That Augustus gave such exhibitions in the Campus Martius, is confirmed by Dio and Suetonius, the former under the year 28 B.C. Τότε δὲ καὶ ἀγὼν γυμνικός, σταδίου τινὸς ἐν τῷ Ἀρείῳ πεδίῳ ξυλίνου κατασκευασθέντος, ἐποιήθη (53. 1). *Athletas quoque* (*edidit*) *exstructis in campo Martio sedilibus ligneis* (*Aug.* 43).

IV. 35–36. *Ludos feci meo nomine quater, aliorum autem magistratuum vicem ter et viciens.*

12. 7–8. Θέας ἐπόησα δι' ἐμοῦ τετράκις, διὰ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων ἀρχῶν ἐν μέρει τρὶς καὶ εἰκοσάκις.

Four times I celebrated games in my own name, and three and twenty times in the place of other magistrates.

That the Greek version has blundered in the rendering of *aliorum magistratuum vicem*, is clear from Suetonius (*Aug.* 43), who on this occasion really seems to be citing the Monument. *Fecisse se ludos ait suo nomine quater, pro aliis magistratibus, qui aut abessent aut non sufficerent, ter et viciens.*

Of extraordinary games given in the circus by Augustus we know only of those in 44 B.C. to celebrate the victories of Julius Caesar (Dio Cass. 45. 6). The occasions on which he undertook the *ludi circenses* or *scaenici* to relieve the magistrates responsible for them were of course not extraordinary, and we should therefore not expect to find any record of them in the historians.

IV. 36–37. *Pro conlegio quindecimvirorum magister conlegii collega M. Agrippa ludos saeclares C. Furnio C. Silano cos. feci.*

12. 9–12. Ὑπὲρ τῶν δεκαπέντε ἀνδρῶν, ἔχων συνάρχοντα Μάρκον Ἀγρίππαν, τὰς θέας διὰ ἑκατὸν ἐτῶν γεινομένας ὀνομαζομένας σαικλάρεις ἐπόησα Γαΐῳ Φουρνίῳ καὶ Γαΐῳ Σειλανῷ ὑπάτοις.

Representing the college of the Fifteen as Master of the college, with M. Agrippa as my colleague, I celebrated the ludi saeculares in the consulship of C. Furnius and C. Silanus.

The *ludi saeculares* were celebrated by Augustus and Agrippa on the first three days of June in the year 17 B.C. Suetonius merely mentions the celebration as one of several revivals of obsolete rites (*Aug.* 31), while Dio Cassius (54. 18) says as briefly τά τε σαικουλάρια τὰ πέμπτα ἐπετέλεσε. According to tradition there had been four previous celebrations, the dates of which are given by Censorinus as 449, 348, 249, and 149 B.C., the fifth celebration, which should have been in 49, having been omitted owing to the outbreak of civil war. But Augustus, following a Sibylline oracle, discovered or invented a new calculation, by which the Etruscan *saeculum* was 110 years, and the last *ludi saeculares* were assigned to 126 B.C. What seems clear is that, apart from the ratio on which he proceeded (discussed by Tacitus in one of the lost books of the *Histories*; cf. *Ann.* 11. 11), Augustus fixed upon the year 17 B.C., because it marked the end of his first ten years' *imperium*, and also the consummation of his social and domestic legislation, which was to usher in a new and purer age.[1]

That this, like the other examples of religious revival, emanated from Augustus himself, cannot admit of doubt. But the first official step was taken by the senate, which in February issued a decree authorizing the celebration of the games, and entrusting their management to the two heads of the state, Augustus and Agrippa, associated since the previous year as joint holders of the tribunician power (*C. I. L.* vi. 877).[2] But

[1] Claudius found it convenient to return to the hundred years' *saeculum*, but dated it from the foundation of the city, the eight hundredth anniversary of which fell in A.D. 47. Domitian, ignoring the celebration of Claudius as irregular, reverted to the system of Augustus, though instead of waiting till A.D. 94, he celebrated the *ludi* in p. 88 (*Ann.* 11. 11).

[2] This is all that is implied in the words of the *s. c.*, *edentibus imp. C. Caesare M. Agrippa tribunicia potestate.* Their management of the games was not

the actual carrying out of the *ludi* belonged to the *XVviri sacris faciundis*, Augustus being, as he says, *magister collegii*, and Agrippa a member (Dio Cass. 54. 19). That it was a matter for the *XVviri*, is indicated by the words of Augustus, *pro conlegio quindecimvirorum . . . feci*, and by those of Tacitus, who says that he had special knowledge of Domitian's celebration, as *sacerdotio quindecimvirali praeditus* (loc. cit.). It is of course well-known that the *Carmen Saeculare* of Horace was composed to be sung by bands of young men and maidens on this occasion, and the contents of the poem made sufficiently plain what Augustus intended to signify by the revived *ludi saeculares*. But the whole picture of the solemn celebration with all its minutest details has been brought before our eyes by the so-called *Acta Ludorum Saecularium*, discovered within the last twenty years in the Campus Martius (*Ephemeris Epigraphica*, v. 20). Excellent use of this unique inscription has been made by Ferrero, vol. v, pp. 81 to 94, by Prof. Pelham, *Essays on Roman History*, pp. 29 ff., and by W. Warde Fowler, *Roman Essays and Interpretations*, p. 111. I will only note the following points: (*a*) the details for the three days' solemnities were fixed in advance by decrees of the sacred college; (*b*) the two central figures are Augustus and Agrippa, though the former naturally overshadows his colleague[1]; (*c*) the processional hymn is specially referred to as composed by Horace; (*d*) the singing of it by twenty-seven youths and twenty-seven maidens is described as taking place on the third day (3 June) in the *Atrium* of the temple of Apollo on the Palatine.

The Monument is, of course, throughout a bare record of

of course by virtue of the *trib. pot.*, except in so far as that marked them out as heads of the state.

[1] It is hardly worth while to ask whether Agrippa is spoken of as colleague in the *tribunicia potestas*, or in the charge of the games. Augustus certainly had both in his mind, for Agrippa was only associated with Augustus in the religious ceremony because he had been recently associated in the *summi fastigii vocabulum*.

facts without comment. But, when we consider how much this celebration meant to Augustus himself, and what it was intended to promise the Roman world, the brevity and meagreness of the statement are extraordinary. For Augustus it meant the auspicious opening of a second period of power, in which he was now supported by a faithful and well-tried colleague, and which he might ultimately hope to pass on to the two young grandsons whom he had just adopted (Dio Cass. 54. 18, and see above). For the state it was to mean a new age of regeneration and reform, in which public and domestic virtues were once more to flourish amid a thrifty, healthy, and growing population, and under the protection of the propitiated national gods. And yet the act symbolic of so much for the present and the future occupies less space in the record of *res gestae* than the enumeration of the shows of wild beasts exhibited for the amusement of the Roman rabble.

IV. 38–39. *Consul XIII ludos Martiales primus feci, quos post id tempus deinceps insequentibus annis . . . fecerunt consules.*

12. 12–15. Ὕπατος τρισκαιδέκατον θέας Ἄρεως πρῶτος ἐπόησα, ἃς μετ' ἐκεῖνον χρόνον ἐξῆς τοῖς μετέπειτα ἐνιαυτοῖς δ⟨όγματι συνκλήτου σὺν ἐ⟩μοὶ ἐπόησαν οἱ ὕπατοι.

In my thirteenth consulship I was the first to celebrate the ludi Martiales, which after that time the consuls regularly celebrated in the succeeding years.

These *ludi Martiales*, alluded to by Suetonius (*Claud.* 4), were instituted when the temple of Mars Ultor was dedicated in 2 B.C. That they were afterwards superintended by the consuls, appears from Dio 56. 46.

IV. 39–42. *Venationes bestiarum Africanarum meo nomine aut filiorum meorum et nepotum in circo aut in foro aut in amphitheatris populo dedi sexiens et viciens,*

quibus confecta sunt bestiarum circiter tria millia et quingentae.

The Greek, with the exception of the one word θηρίων, is lost.

Six-and-twenty times I provided for the people in the circus or the forum or the amphitheatres exhibitions of African wild beasts in my own name or in the names of my sons or grandsons, in which exhibitions about three thousand five hundred animals were killed.

Suetonius (*Aug.* 43) gives general confirmation: [*Circensibus ludis gladiatoriisque muneribus frequentissime editis interiecit plerumque bestiarum Africanarum venationes,*] *non in foro modo nec in amphitheatro, sed et in circo et in Saeptis, et aliquando nihil praeter venationem edidit.* For particular instances, we have the statement of Dio (54. 26) that at the dedication of the theatre of Marcellus in 13 B. C. (or according to Pliny in 11 B. C.) 600 African wild beasts were killed. Again, in 2 B. C., the year in which L. Caesar was *consul designatus*, and the temple of Mars Ultor was dedicated, 36 crocodiles were killed (55. 10). Lastly, in A. D. 12, a *venatio* was given in the name of Germanicus, and 200 lions were exhibited (Dio Cass. 56. 27).

CAP. XXIII

IV. 43–48. *Navalis proeli spectaclum populo dedi trans Tiberim, in quo loco nunc nemus est Caesarum, cavato solo in longitudinem mille et octingentos pedes, in latitudinem mille et ducenti. In quo triginta rostratae naves, triremes aut biremes, plures autem minores inter se conflixerunt. Quibus in classibus pugnaverunt praeter remiges millia hominum tria circiter.*

12. 21–24—13. 1–4. Ναυμαχίας θέαν τῷ δήμῳ ἔδωκα πέραν τοῦ Τιβέριδος, ἐν ᾧ τόπῳ ἐστὶ νῦν ἄλσος Καισάρων,

ἐκκεχωκὼς τὸ ἔδαφος εἰς μῆκος χειλίων ὀκτακοσίων ποδῶν, εἰς πλάτος χιλίων διακοσίων. ἐν ᾗ τριάκοντα ναῦς ἔμβολα ἔχουσαι τριήρεις ἢ δίκροτοι, αἱ δὲ ἥσσονες πλείους ἐναυμάχησαν. Ἐν τούτῳ τῷ στόλῳ ἠγωνίσαντο ἔξω τῶν ἐρετῶν πρόσπου ἄνδρες τρισχείλιοι.

I gave the people the exhibition of a naval battle on the spot beyond the Tiber where now the grove of the Caesars stands; having had the ground hollowed out over an area of eighteen hundred feet long and twelve hundred feet wide. In this space thirty beaked ships, all of them triremes or biremes, and a large number of smaller vessels, fought with one another. On board the contending fleets, in addition to the rowers, there were about 3,000 combatants.

From Velleius (2. 100) we learn the date of this naval spectacle, 2 B. C., its occasion, the dedication of the temple of Mars Ultor, and the fact that gladiatorial games were held at the same time. Dio (55. 10) says that the contending fleets represented the Persians and Athenians, and that there were still traces of the excavated area in his day. Suetonius (*Aug.* 43) apparently abbreviates from the Monument: *navale proelium circa Tiberim* (*dedit*), *cavato solo in quo nunc Caesarum nemus est.* Claudius gave a similar spectacle, but made it even more realistic by having it on the Fucine lake, while the ships employed were of a larger size than triremes (*Ann.* 12. 56).

CAP. XXIV

IV. 49–51. *In templis omnium civitatium provinciae Asiae victor ornamenta reposui, quae spoliatis templis is cum quo bellum gesseram privatim possederat.*

13. 5–7. Ἐν ναοῖς πασῶν πόλεων τῆς Ἀσίας νεικήσας τὰ ἀναθέματα ἀποκατέστησα, ἃ εἶχεν ἰδίᾳ ἱεροσυλήσας ὁ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ διαγωνισθεὶς πολέμιος.

After my victory I replaced in the temples of all the communities of the province of Asia the ornaments which my adversary in the war had, after despoiling the temples, taken into his own possession.

This was after Actium and after the deaths of Antony and Cleopatra in Egypt, but before the return of Augustus to Rome. Antony, whose name, like that of Lepidus in II. 23 ff., and of Sex. Pompeius in V. 1 ff., is carefully avoided, had ransacked the temples of Asia for the benefit of Cleopatra. Dio and Strabo both bear testimony to this : πάντα γὰρ, ὡς εἰπεῖν, καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῶν ἁγιωτάτων ἱερῶν ἀναθήματα ἡ Κλεοπάτρα ἀνελομένη συνεπλήθυσε τὰ λάφυρα τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις (Dio 51. 17). Strabo (p. 595) speaks of a statue belonging to the temple of Aias at Rhoeteum in the Troad ὃν ἅπαντος Ἀντωνίου κομισθέντα εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἀπέδωκε τοῖς Ῥοιτειεῦσι πάλιν, καθάπερ καὶ ἄλλοις ἄλλους, ὁ Σεβαστὸς Καῖσαρ· τὰ γὰρ κάλλιστα ἀναθήματα ἐκ τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων ἱερῶν ὁ μὲν ἦρε τῇ Αἰγυπτίᾳ χαριζόμενος, ὁ δὲ θεοῖς ἀπέδωκε. For another act of sacrilege by Antony and restoration by Augustus to the Temple of Hera at Samos, cf. Strab. p. 637.

IV. 51–54. *Statuae meae pedestres et equestres et in quadrigeis argenteae steterunt in urbe XXC circiter, quas ipse sustuli exque ea pecunia dona aurea in aede Apollinis meo nomine et illorum, qui mihi statuarum honorem habuerunt, posui.*

13. 7–13. Ἀνδριάντες πεζοὶ καὶ ἔφιπποί μου καὶ ἐφ' ἅρμασιν ἀργυροῖ εἱστήκεισαν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐνγὺς ὀγδοήκοντα, οὓς αὐτὸς ἦρα, ἐκ τούτου τε τοῦ χρήματος ἀναθέματα χρυσᾶ ἐν τῷ ναῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τῷ τε ἐμῷ ὀνόματι καὶ ἐκείνων, οἵτινές με τούτοις τοῖς ἀνδριᾶσιν ἐτείμησαν, ἀνέθηκα.

Silver statues of myself, standing or on horseback or sitting in a chariot, were set up in the city to the number of about eighty, which I myself took down, and out of the

money value I set up gifts of gold in the temple of Apollo in my own name and in the names of those who had honoured me with the statues.

The assertion is confirmed by Suetonius (*Aug.* 52) and Dio Cassius (53. 22). *In urbe . . . argenteas statuas olim sibi positas conflavit omnes exque iis aureas cortinas Apollini Palatino dedicavit.* ὁ Αὔγουστος καὶ ἀνδριάντας τινὰς ἑαυτοῦ ἀργυροῦς, πρός τε τῶν φίλων καὶ πρὸς δήμων τινῶν γεγονότας, ἐς νόμισμα κατέκοψε.

CAP. XXV

V. 1–3. *Mare pacavi a praedonibus. Eo bello servorum, qui fugerant a dominis suis et arma contra rem publicam ceperant, triginta fere millia capta dominis ad supplicium sumendum tradidi.*

13. 14–16. Θάλασσαν πειρατευομένην ὑπὸ ἀποστατῶν δούλων εἰρήνευσα· Ἐξ ὧν τρεῖς που μυριάδας τοῖς δεσπόταις εἰς κόλασιν παρέδωκα.

I conquered the pirates and restored peace to the seas. In that war I handed over to their masters for punishment nearly 30,000 slaves who had run away from their owners, and taken up arms against the republic.

This is an allusion to the final victory over Sextus Pompeius in 36 B.C. Pompeius had for years maintained an independent position, and having added fresh ships to the remainder of his father's fleet, had succeeded in occupying Sardinia as well as Sicily (see below V. 33–34). In this way he had been able to blockade the Italian coasts and produced scarcity, and even the danger of famine in Rome. By the treaty of Misenum in 38 B.C. he had been taken into alliance by Octavian and Antony, undertaking the task of keeping the seas clear of pirates (App. *B. C.* 5. 72). He had, however, continued to abuse his position, recruiting his armies from runaway slaves

both from Sicily and Italy, while his fleets practised undisguised piracy. Velleius (2. 73) sums up the situation thus: *Is tum* [*Sextus Pompeius*] *occupata Sicilia servitia fugitivosque in numerum exercitus sui recipiens magnum modum legionum effecerat, perque Menam et Menecraten paternos libertos, praefectos classium, latrociniis ac praedationibus infestato mari ad se exercitumque tuendum rapto utebatur, cum eum non depuderet vindicatum armis ac ductu patris sui mare infestare piraticis scceleribus.* On these grounds, after the conference at Tarentum in 37 B.C., Octavian resumed the war (App. *B. C.* 5. 77–90). With regard to the treatment of the runaway slaves, Appian (5. 131) says: ἀχθέντας αὐτοὺς ἐς Ῥώμην ὁ Καῖσαρ ἀπέδωκεν αὐτῶν τε Ῥωμαίων καὶ Ἰταλῶν τοῖς δεσπόταις ἢ διαδόχοις αὐτῶν, ἀπέδωκε δὲ καὶ Σικελιώταις, while those whose masters were not identified, were crucified. That Pompey, as suggested by Ferrero, was supported by Italian sympathy, as representing the free republic, is highly improbable in view of the hardships caused by the blockade, and Augustus had some justification for describing the war as one against pirates rather than a branch of the civil war. The Greek version is here somewhat freer and less precise than usual.

V. 3–6. *Iuravit in mea verba tota Italia sponte sua et me belli, quo vici ad Actium, ducem depoposcit. Iuraverunt in eadem verba provinciae Galliae, Hispaniae, Africa, Sicilia, Sardinia.*

13. 16–20. Ὤμοσεν εἰς τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους ἅπασα ἡ Ἰταλία ἑκοῦσα, κἀμὲ πολέμου, ᾧ ἐπ' Ἀκτίῳ ἐνείκησα, ἡγεμόνα ἐξῃτήσατο. Ὤμοσαν εἰς τοὺς αὐτοὺς λόγους ἐπαρχεῖαι Γαλατία, Ἱσπανία, Λιβύη, Σικελία, Σαρδώ.

The whole of Italy of its own free will took the oath of fidelity to me, and demanded me as its leader in the war of which Actium was the crowning victory. An oath was also taken to the same effect by the provinces of Gaul, Spain, Africa, Sicily, and Sardinia.

There can be no doubt that, apart from material resources, the support given to Augustus by Rome and Italy added a weight and prestige to his position in the eyes of the Roman world which Antony did not possess. Italy was already recovering from the first high-handed acts of the triumvirate, the new military colonists were settling down, the country was enjoying relief from the blockade of Sex. Pompeius, and saw in Octavian's victory the best means of warding off civil war from its prosperous towns and farms. Even the colonists from the armies of Antony, a fact noted both by Suetonius and Dio, joined in the general enthusiasm. *Bononiensibus . . . publice, quod in Antoniorum clientela antiquitus erant, gratiam fecit coniurandi cum tota Italia pro partibus suis* (*Aug.* 17). Similarly Dio, in mentioning the unanimity of Italy, adds, πάντας γὰρ τοὺς ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀντωνίου ἀποικισθέντας, τὰ μὲν ἐκφοβήσας, ἅτε ὀλίγους ὄντας, τὰ δὲ καὶ εὐεργετήσας, προσετέθειτο· τά τε γὰρ ἄλλα καὶ τοὺς τὴν Βονωνίαν ἐποικοῦντας αὐτὸς αἷθις . . . προσκατεστήσατο (Dio 50. 6). It was probably this universal oath of fidelity which Augustus interpreted as the *universorum consensus*, by which he was constituted *omnium rerum potitus* (see below VI. 14). With regard to the provinces, Dio in the passage just cited in addition to those enumerated by Augustus mentions Illyricum. Mommsen believes that the historian is antedating the existence of Illyricum as a separate province, and regards its omission by Augustus as an indication that it did not rank among the Western provinces until after Actium. To maintain this point, it is necessary to assume that C. Antonius, Q. Cornificius, Sulpicius Rufus, and P. Vatinius, all of whom are spoken of as holding command in Illyricum between 49 and 44 B.C., were not governors of the province, but merely generals acting against the Dalmatae. It is certain, however, that Illyricum was within the provincial system between 59 and 49 B.C., and also that Caesar proposed, as a compromise, to hold it with one legion as a separate province (Suet. *Iul.* 29). If therefore the officers mentioned above were not governors, they must have been

legates of the proconsul of Cisalpine Gaul. Of this there is no indication, and after 42 B.C. there was no province of Cisalpine Gaul, so that Illyricum must either have lost its provincial status, or have been attached to Macedonia, or have been a separate province. As the first hypothesis is inconceivable, and the second ruled out by the fact that Macedonia belonged to Antony's half of the empire, I see no possibility of escaping the third supposition. Nor is the omission of Illyricum by Augustus made any easier by Mommsen's argument, for the adhesion of a district certainly occupied by several legions we should hardly have expected to be passed over in silence. The omission, therefore, is a difficulty not satisfactorily explained.

V. 6–9. *Qui sub signis meis tum militaverint, fuerunt senatores plures quam DCC, in iis qui vel antea vel postea consules facti sunt ad eum diem quo scripta sunt haec. LXXXIII, sacerdotes circiter CLXX.*

13. 20–24—14. 1. *Οἱ ὑπ' ἐμαῖς σημέαις τότε στρατευσάμενοι ἦσαν συνκλητικοὶ πλείους ἑπτακοσίων· ἐν αὐτοῖς οἳ ἢ πρότερον ἢ μετέπειτα ἐγένοντο ὕπατοι εἰς ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν, ἐν ᾗ ταῦτα γέγραπται, ὀγδοήκοντα τρεῖς, ἱερεῖς πρόσπου ἑκατὸν ἑβδομήκοντα.*

Among those who at that time served under my standards were more than seven hundred senators; out of that number, either before that date or afterwards, up to the day on which these records were written, eighty-three attained the consulship, and about one hundred and seventy were elected to priesthoods.

It is impossible to verify the numbers given by Augustus, but there is no reason to suppose that they are not correct. Of the senators, more than 300, who were not with Octavian, many had joined Antony, while no doubt some awaited events.

The other figures were easily ascertainable from the *Fasti consulares*, and the records of the various sacerdotal colleges, including the revived *Fratres Arvales* and *Sodales Titii*.

CAP. XXVI

V. 9–10. *Omnium provinciarum populi Romani, quibus finitimae fuerunt gentes quae non parerent imperio nostro, fines auxi.*

14. 2–4. *Πασῶν ἐπαρχειῶν δήμου Ῥωμαίων, αἷς ὅμορα ἦν ἔθνη τὰ μὴ ὑποτασσόμενα τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ἡγεμονίᾳ, τοὺς ὅρους ἐπεύξησα.*

I extended the frontiers of all the provinces of the Roman people, which had as neighbours races not obedient to our empire.

There can be little doubt that, in spite of the general terms in which this statement is couched, Augustus is alluding almost exclusively to his frontier policy in the West. In Asia Minor it is true that the existence of untamed robber tribes in the mountainous regions of Lycaonia and Pisidia was a possible menace to the tranquillity of Cilicia and Asia. But Augustus extended the frontiers of neither province, the latter being even considerably curtailed. Amyntas of Galatia was at first employed in subduing these tribes, and on his death in 25 B.C. Augustus made the kingdom of Galatia into a province. There was, however, to this extent a widening of the Galatian frontiers (and Augustus may have included it in his statement), in that Paphlagonia was embraced by the new province on the north, while on the south it was pushed beyond the limits of the Celtic kingdom so as to include the mountainous region which under the republic had nominally belonged to Cilicia. Within these extended borders of Galatia the intractable tribes were curbed by a ring of fortress colonies such as Antioch in

Pisidia, Iconium, Parlaïs, Cremna, and Comana (see below on V. 36). Whether, as Mommsen suggests, the Arabian expedition in 24–25 B.C. was intended to ease the southern frontiers of Syria, seems to me much more open to doubt, and, at any rate, as the expedition failed, Augustus cannot reasonably be supposed to include it in his present statement.

On the other hand, the change made in regard to Numidia in 25 B.C., when King Iuba was transferred to Mauretania, and his former kingdom was made part of the province of Africa, was certainly a case of extended provincial boundaries, and was due to the menacing proximity of the Berber tribes in the Aures Mountains and beyond them. As a matter of fact, it was almost exclusively in this extended portion of the province that the *legio III Augusta* and the auxiliary forces attached to it were employed in defending the frontiers of the empire (Tac. *Hist.* 2. 97). But, as already remarked, Augustus was mainly thinking of the frontier rectifications made during his reign in the direction of the Danube and the Rhine. In the former region Macedonia and Illyricum were the two frontier provinces under the republic, and both were exposed to *finitimae gentes quae non parerent imperio nostro*. The extension of the Illyrican frontier was commenced in the series of campaigns carried out by Octavian or his generals from 36 to 33 B.C., in the course of which the mountains were passed, and a military outpost pushed forward as far as Siscia on the Save. After Actium the Macedonian frontier was protected, not by extending the province, but by an expedition under the proconsul, Licinius Crassus, in 29 B.C., the result of which was to break up the Dacian and Moesian tribes south of the Danube. The exact condition of the country afterwards known as Moesia during the succeeding years is uncertain, but, though not yet a province, it must have been in some way under Roman surveillance. With the way so prepared, it was simple some seventeen or eighteen years later to create the military province of Moesia, which for more than a century had to deal with the

dangerous tribes beyond the lower Danube. This was perhaps extending the frontiers of the empire rather than of a province, but the campaigns of Tiberius in 12 B.C., described by Augustus himself below (V. 44 ff.), extended the boundaries of Illyricum nominally to the Danube, taking in the whole country, which, after the great rebellion (A.D. 6–9), became the separate province of Illyricum Inferius or Pannonia. This extension of Illyricum, though the military occupation did not pass the line of the Drave, successfully met the danger from the *finitimae gentes* of Dalmatians and Pannonians for the next nineteen years.

In the direction of the Rhine it cannot be said that under Augustus there was any extension of an existing province, as Gaul was from the outset bounded by the Rhine, and never passed beyond it. But it was the proximity and warlike character of the German tribes beyond the river that led to the aggressive campaigns of Drusus and Tiberius from 13 to 7 B.C., and again of the latter from A.D. 4 to 6. By the last date, and indeed for years previously, the whole country of Germany between the Rhine and the Elbe had been reduced virtually to the condition of a Roman province. It is enough to recall the words of Velleius (2. 97), who declares that Tiberius *sic perdomuit* (*Germaniam*) *ut in formam paene stipendiariae redigeret provinciae*. Everything apparently was ready for the formal establishment of the province of Germany, when the Pannonian rebellion complicated the whole situation on the two Western frontiers. After its suppression, and especially after the disaster to the army of Quintilius Varus in A.D. 10, the policy of creating the new province beyond the Rhine was given up. But up to the time of Augustus' death, and for several years afterwards, Roman armies were still engaged in restoring their military prestige by overrunning Germany, and as the next paragraph of the Monument shows, Augustus to the end of his life used language implying that Germany was still within the limits of the Roman empire.

V. 10–12. *Gallias et Hispanias provincias et Germaniam qua includit Oceanus a Gadibus ad ostium Albis fluminis pacavi.*

14. 4–7. Γαλατίαν καὶ Ἱσπανίας, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Γερμανίαν καθὼς Ὠκεανὸς περικλείει ἀπὸ Γαδείρων μέχρι στόματος Ἄλβιος ποταμοῦ ἐν εἰρήνῃ κατέστησα.

I restored peace to all the provinces of Gaul and Spain and to Germany, to all that region washed by the Ocean from Gades to the mouth of the Elbe.

This statement implies, (*a*) that Germany, as well as the provinces of Spain and Gaul, belonged to the sphere, for the peace of which Rome was responsible; (*b*) that all these regions were at peace in A.D. 14; but (*c*) that in each group peace had been disturbed and then restored. In Spain the allusion is of course to the wars with the Cantabri, apparently concluded in 26–25 B.C., but again recrudescent till 19 B.C. In Gaul no interruptions to the *fida et immota pax* are on record, except those implied by the triumphs of C. Carinas over the Morini in 28 B.C., and of M. Messalla over the Aquitani in 27 B.C. In the case of Germany, many vicissitudes, not all tending to increase Roman prestige, are passed over in silence, and the condition of the country at the time when the words were written is not represented with candour. At the same time Augustus in this meagre statement does less than justice to the results achieved in the West, the peaceful development of Spain and Gaul, and the successful maintenance of the imperial frontiers.

V. 12–14. *Alpes a regione ea quae proxima est Hadriano mari, ad Tuscum pacari feci nulli genti bello per iniuriam inlato.*

14. 7–10. Ἄλπης ἀπὸ κλίματος τοῦ πλησίον Εἰονίου κόλπου μέχρι Τυρρηνικῆς θαλάσσης εἰρηνεύεσθαι πεπόηκα, οὐδενὶ ἔθνει ἀδίκως ἐπενεχθέντος πολέμου.

Peace too I caused to be established in the Alps from the region nearest to the Hadriatic as far as the Tuscan sea, while no tribe was wantonly attacked by war.

The completion of this Alpine settlement is commemorated by the trophy set up near Monaco, the inscription on which is preserved by Pliny (*H.N.* iii, 24): *Imp. Caesari divi f. Augusto pontifici maxumo, imp. XIV, tribunic. potestate XVII, S. P. Q. R. quod eius ductu auspiciisque gentes Alpinae omnes quae a mari supero ad inferum pertinebant sub imperium populi Romani sunt redactae.* To this is appended a list of forty-six tribes. The date of this monument was 7–6 B. C.; some nine years after the work was finished by Drusus and Tiberius. For the process of pacification was a gradual one, rendered necessary in the first place by the extension of Italy to the Alps in 42 B. C. and the removal of the proconsul and his army from Cisalpine Gaul. The punitive expeditions, by which the tribes enumerated by Pliny were subdued, were often petty and isolated, but that of Varro Muraena in 25 B.C., ending in the practical extermination of the Salassi, stands out from the rest, and perhaps in this case pacification was a euphemism (Dio Cass. 53. 25; Suet. *Aug.* 21). The tribes, however, were not all treated with the same severity, and many, like the Camunni, the Trumpelini, the Anauni, and others, were 'attributed' to frontier *municipia* and colonies. But the really decisive steps in the Alpine settlement were taken in 16 and 15 B. C. In the former year the kingdom of Noricum was taken over, and the tribes or *civitates* placed under a Roman official, *praefectus* or *procurator*. In the following year a double attack was made upon the Raeti and Vindelici, from the side of Italy by Drusus, and from Gaul by Tiberius (Suet. *Aug.* 21). As a result of this, the important military province of Raetia was created under an equestrian governor, and garrisoned by strong forces of auxiliary troops. For the future the Alpine mountaineers, so troublesome in the past, furnished numerous

and valuable recruits to the auxiliary service. A year later, the Ligurian inhabitants of the Maritime Alps were dealt with, and the province of that name established, while farther to the north-east fourteen or fifteen *civitates* [1] were placed under Cottius, son of their former king Domnus, who, though with the title of *praefectus*, was as much client king as Roman governor. Perhaps no frontier was more systematically and successfully dealt with than that of North Italy by this Alpine settlement.

V. 14–18. *Classis mea per Oceanum ab ostio Rheni ad solis orientis regionem usque ad fines Cimbrorum navigavit, quo neque terra neque mari quisquam Romanus ante id tempus adit, Cimbrique et Charydes et Semnones et eiusdem tractus alii Germanorum populi per legatos amicitiam meam et populi Romani petierunt.*

14. 10–17. Στόλος ἐμὸς διὰ Ὠκεανοῦ ἀπὸ στόματος Ῥήνου ὡς πρὸς ἀνατολὰς μέχρι ἔθνους Κίμβρων διέπλευσεν, οὗ οὔτε κατὰ γῆν οὔτε κατὰ θάλασσαν Ῥωμαίων τις πρὸ τούτου τοῦ χρόνου προσῆλθεν· καὶ Κίμβροι καὶ Χάλυβες καὶ Σέμνονες ἄλλα τε πολλὰ ἔθνη Γερμανῶν διὰ πρεσβειῶν τὴν ἐμὴν φιλίαν καὶ τὴν δήμου Ῥωμαίων ἠτήσαντο.

My fleet sailed along the Ocean from the mouth of the Rhine as far towards the east as the borders of the Cimbri, whither no Roman before that time had penetrated either by land or sea. The Cimbri and the Charydes and the Semnones and other German peoples of the same region through their envoys petitioned for my friendship and that of the Roman people.

[1] Pliny (loc. cit.) says that the fifteen *Cottianae civitates* were not added to the list on the trophy, because they were not hostile. On the arch of Segusio (Susa) fourteen *civitates* are mentioned, of which six are included in the list on the trophy.

A passage of Velleius (2. 106–7) makes it certain that this statement refers to the campaign of Tiberius in A. D. 5. With his land army Tiberius had penetrated 400 miles beyond the Rhine and had reached the Elbe. The Germans on the farther bank were astonished, Velleius says, by the appearance of a Roman fleet, *quae Oceani circumnavigaverat sinus, ab inaudito atque incognito ante mari et flumine Albi subvecta . . . exercitui Caesarique se iunxit.* The words of Augustus and an allusion to the expedition by Pliny (*H. N.* 2. 67. 157) together with an indication in Ptolemy (2. 11. 12) make the course of the expedition fairly clear. Pliny says: *Septentrionalis Oceanus maiori ex parte navigatus est auspiciis divi Augusti Germaniam classe circumvecta ad Cimbrorum promuntorium.* It must have sailed therefore past the coast of Jutland, where Ptolemy places the Cimbri, as far as the Skagerack, whence, without venturing farther into the unknown North Sea, it turned southward and sailed up the Elbe to bring supplies and equipment to Tiberius. The combined demonstration clearly had its effect upon the tribes. Not only the powerful Semnones between the Elbe and the Oder appealed for the friendship of Rome, but the remnants of the Cimbri from the remote region of Denmark ἔπεμψαν τῷ Σεβαστῷ δῶρον τὸν ἱερώτατον παρ' αὐτοῖς λέβητα, αἰτούμενοι φιλίαν καὶ ἀμνηστίαν τῶν ὑπηργμένων (Strabo, p. 293). Whether these Cimbri were really the surviving remnant of the historic tribe which had given the Romans such cause to remember them, is perhaps doubtful. The Charydes, at least under this form of the name, cannot be identified.

V. 18–23. *Meo iussu et auspicio ducti sunt duo exercitus eodem fere tempore in Aethiopiam et in Arabiam, quae appellatur eudaemon, maximaeque hostium gentis utriusque copiae caesae sunt in acie et complura oppida capta. In Aethiopiam usque ad oppidum Nabata perventum est, cui proxima est Meroë. In Arabiam usque in fines Sabaeorum processit exercitus ad oppidum Mariba.*

14. 17–24. *Ἐμῇ ἐπιταγῇ καὶ οἰωνοῖς αἰσίοις δύο στρατεύματα ἐπέβη Αἰθιοπίᾳ καὶ Ἀραβίᾳ τῇ εὐδαίμονι καλουμένῃ, μεγάλας τε τῶν πολεμίων δυνάμεις κατέκοψεν ἐν παρατάξει καὶ πλείστας πόλεις δοριαλώτους ἔλαβεν καὶ προέβη ἐν Αἰθιοπίᾳ μέχρι πόλεως Ναβάτης ἥτις ἐστὶν ἔγγιστα Μερόῃ, ἐν Ἀραβίᾳ δὲ μέχρι πόλεως Μαρίβας.*

By my command and under my auspices two armies were led almost at the same time, one into Ethiopia, the other into that part of Arabia which is called Felix; and large forces of the enemy belonging to both races were killed in battle, and many towns captured. In Ethiopia the army advanced as far as Napata, the nearest station to Meroe; in Arabia to the borders of the Sabaei to the town of Mariba.

Both these expeditions were conducted from Egypt, but they had very different objects and met with very different success. The Arabian expedition was led by Aelius Gallus, who is spoken of by Strabo (p. 118) as *ἀνὴρ φίλος ἡμῖν καὶ ἑταῖρος*. On Strabo's authority we may take it that the object of the undertaking was to develop the commercial relations between Egypt and India by getting possession of Arabia Felix and its important harbour of Aden. Under the Ptolemies Egyptian trade with the East had been heavily handicapped by the competition of the Arabians, and to destroy this competition, Augustus intended to subjugate the whole country of Yemen (Strabo, p. 780). The details of the expedition are made sufficiently clear from Strabo (loc. cit.) and Dio Cassius (53. 29). The objects aimed at were no secrets, and included the treasure supposed to have been accumulated by the Sabaean kings. Elaborate preparations were made. Eighty ships of war were collected at Arsinoe (near Suez), and 130 transports were specially constructed. These were to convey 10,000 men of the Egyptian army, while Herod sent auxiliaries from Judaea

(Joseph. *Ant. Jud.* 15. 9. 3), and the Nabataean king Obodas provided contingents and a leader and guide in Sullaeus. But Aelius Gallus must have been thoroughly incompetent. Even his friend Strabo admits that the war-ships were useless against an enemy who had no fleet, while the transports were unsuited to the shallows and surf of the Arabian coast. From Arsinoe the flotilla sailed to Leuke Kome, a port within the Nabataean kingdom, but far distant from the objective of the expedition. Here the winter was spent, and in the spring a disastrous march began through a waterless and unhealthy region. Sullaeus, who acted as guide, was no doubt playing his own hand at his master's game, but Aelius Gallus himself must be held responsible for the plan of campaign, and for neglecting to provide necessary supplies and, above all, drugs. No doubt some towns were captured on the route, but the enemy always avoided fighting, while the Roman army was more than decimated by disease and privation (Dio says, ὥστε τὸ πλεῖον τοῦ στρατοῦ φθαρῆναι). It is true, as Augustus says, that the army reached Mariba, the capital of the Sabaei,[1] but it failed to capture the place, and returned practically a defeated army to Leuke Kome. In view of his own account, Strabo's statement that Aelius Gallus would have subdued the country but for the treachery of Sullaeus, is unconvincing.

As to the date of the expedition, if Aelius Gallus was *praefectus Aegypti* at the time, it must have been in 25–24 B. C. For it is clear from Josephus (loc. *cit.*)[2] that Petronius became *praefectus* in the course of 24 B. C., and if, as Schiller interprets

[1] Dio names the Ἀθλοῦλοι as the farthest tribe whose territory was reached, Strabo the Rhammanitae, Pliny the Calingii. Perhaps Sabaei was a generic or a popular name. Conf. Horace, *Od.* i. 29, 1–4 *Icci, beatis nunc Arabum invides gazis, et acrem militiam paras non ante devictis Sabaeae regibus.*

[2] Josephus speaks of a famine in Judaea in 25 and 24 B. C., and states that in the second year Herod, in order to buy corn ἔπεμπε δ' ἐπ' Αἰγύπτου τὰ χρήματα, Πετρωνίου τὴν ἐπαρχίαν ἀπὸ Καίσαρος εἰληφότος.

the words *eodem fere tempore*, the two expeditions were absolutely simultaneous, Petronius must have been *praefectus*, and Aelius Gallus his lieutenant. But Strabo and Dio Cassius agree that Aelius Gallus was *praefectus* at the time of the expedition,[1] and this seems corroborated by two considerations: (1) If both took place under the governorship of Petronius, it is unlikely that the more important of the two would have been entrusted to a lieutenant, and that the *praefectus* himself would have undertaken a mere punitive expedition. (2) It is inconceivable that Aelius Gallus would have been made *praefectus Aegypti* after so inglorious a failure. So far from agreeing with Schiller that he was promoted, because in spite of losses, the object of the adventure was attained, I believe that he was deposed even before his return, and that Petronius became *praefectus* in the early summer of 24 B.C., while part of the army was still away. It is worth noting that Dio Cassius (53. 29) gives his account of the expedition under the year 24 B.C. after narrating the close of the Cantabrian war, but introduces it with the words, ἐν ᾧ δὲ ταῦτα ἐγίγνετο, ἄλλη τις στρατεία καινὴ ἀρχήν τε ἅμα καὶ τέλος ἔσχεν. This implies that the affair ended in 24, and as the wintering in Leuke Kome is undisputed, it must have begun in 25.

Our knowledge of the Ethiopian expedition is derived from Strabo (p. 820), Dio Cassius (54. 5), and Pliny (*H. N.* 6. 29. 181–2). Schiller, placing both expeditions under the rule of Petronius, and insisting that Augustus mentions the Ethiopian expedition first because it started first, is compelled to reject

[1] Plin. *H. N.* 6. 28. 159; Dio Cass. 53. 29; Strabo (p. 118) very explicitly speaks of the expedition as taking place, ὅτε Γάλλος ἐπῆρχε τῆς Αἰγύπτου. There seems really nothing to be set against this evidence. The fact that Strabo (p. 819) in illustrating the unwarlike character of the Egyptians mentions two seditions, one put down by Cornelius Gallus and the other by Petronius, and then goes on to the Arabian expedition of Aelius Gallus, with which the unwarlike Egyptians had nothing to do, obviously does not imply that Aelius was *praefectus* after the other two.

the evidence of Strabo, who states that the Ethiopians under Candace made an incursion into Egypt, *καταφρονήσαντες τῷ μέρος τι τῆς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ δυνάμεως ἀποσπᾶσθαι μετὰ Γάλλου Αἰλίου πολεμοῦντος πρὸς τοὺς Ἄραβας*. That it was Petronius who took the matter up, and that he was *praefectus Aegypti*, is not disputed. But, though the first act of hostility came from the Ethiopians, it is not improbable that they seized this favourable moment to forestall an already intended expedition into their country. For Strabo (p. 780) declares, *τοῦτον δὲ* (Aelius Gallus) *ἔπεμψεν ὁ Σεβαστὸς Καῖσαρ διαπειρασόμενον τῶν ἐθνῶν καὶ τῶν τόπων τούτων τε* (those in Arabia) *καὶ τῶν Αἰθιοπικῶν*. But, as has been suggested, Gallus was superseded by the middle of 24 B. C., and when Petronius assumed the government of Egypt about that time, he was at once, with a considerably reduced army, called upon to meet an Ethiopian invasion. Obviously it was a surprise, for Syene, Elephantine, and Phylae were captured, and the three auxiliary cohorts on the frontier overpowered. At the same time the statues of the emperor were carried off. It is improbable that Petronius was able to collect his army of 10,000 infantry and 800 cavalry and to transport them to the southern frontier in time for a campaign in 24, and more likely the advance on Premis and the capture and destruction of Napata the royal capital belong to 23 B. C. But it is clear from Dio's account that a second march into Ethiopia was necessary in 22 B. C., the year under which Dio places his narrative. Petronius had already returned to the province with the recovered statues and prisoners, leaving a garrison in Premnis, when Candace, whose army is reckoned at 30,000 men, again advanced and attacked the place, so that Petronius was driven to another campaign. As the result of it, Candace begged for peace, and agreed to send envoys to Augustus. These, according to Strabo, *ἦκον εἰς Σάμον, ἐνταῦθα τοῦ Καίσαρος ὄντος καὶ μέλλοντος εἰς Συρίαν ἐντεῦθεν προϊέναι, Τιβέριον εἰς Ἀρμενίαν στέλλοντος*. As Augustus spent the winter of 21–20 B. C. at Samos, there

must have been some delay, but at any rate, the date makes it impossible to place the two Ethiopian campaigns earlier than 23 and 22 B.C. It was decided to leave the southern frontier of Egypt as it had been, a decision which the projected expedition of Nero was perhaps intended to modify.

Augustus would probably have preferred to omit the Arabian expedition from his record, but, as it was too notorious and too closely associated with the other to be passed over in silence, he puts it in the second place, and makes his statement as to enemies killed and towns captured apply to both expeditions.

CAP. XXVII

V. 24. *Aegyptum imperio populi Romani adieci.*

15. 1. *Αἴγυπτον δήμου Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίᾳ προσέθηκα.*

Egypt I added to the empire of the Roman people.

Julius Caesar had left Egypt nominally in the position of a client kingdom, though under the protection of Roman legions. He feared, according to Suetonius (*Iul.* 35), that a country so rich and productive might, under a powerful and ambitious governor, prove a danger to the empire. The events of the triumvirate had revealed at once the vital importance of Egypt, and the fact that, under an ambitious queen, it was more dangerous in its semi-independence than any disloyal governor could make it. At once, therefore, after the deaths of Antony and Cleopatra, Augustus took the step which in diplomatic language he describes as adding Egypt to the empire of the Roman people (Dio Cass. 51. 17). From 30 B.C. accordingly Egypt became in a sense a province, but without the usual provincial organization. In point of fact, Augustus, far more really than Antony had dreamed of becoming, became king of Egypt. The country was never even nominally or theoretically subject to the senate. Indeed, from the first no senators were allowed to enter Egypt

at all without permission. For the first time a Roman knight, Cornelius Gallus, was placed in command of a legionary army and entrusted with the administration of what was, again in diplomatic language, called a province. His title was *praefectus Aegypti* (ἔπαρχος), but he was virtually, as Tacitus says, a viceroy. The centralized and purely personal government of the Ptolemies was maintained unchanged, the country simply becoming a part of the *domus Caesaris* (cf. *domi retinere*), and its enormous revenues technically falling under the *patrimonium Caesaris*. Three passages of Tacitus sufficiently bring out both the peculiar treatment of Egypt and the reasons for it. (*a*) *Hist.* 1. 11 *Aegyptum copiasque quibus coerceretur iam inde a divo Augusto equites Romani obtinent loco regum; ita visum expedire provinciam aditu difficilem, annonae fecundam, superstitione ac lascivia discordem et mobilem, insciam legum, ignaram magistratuum, domi retinere.* (*b*) *Ann.* 12. 60 *Nam divus Augustus apud equestres qui Aegypto praesiderent lege agi decretaque eorum perinde haberi iusserat ac si magistratus Romani constituissent.* (*c*) *Ann.* 2. 59 *Nam Augustus inter alia dominationis arcana . . . seposuit Aegyptum, ne fame urgeret Italiam quisquis eam provinciam claustraque terrae ac maris quamvis levi praesidio adversus ingentes exercitus insedisset.*

V. 24–31. *Armeniam maiorem interfecto rege eius Artaxe cum possem facere provinciam, malui maiorum nostrorum exemplo regnum id Tigrani regis Artavasdis filio, nepoti autem Tigranis regis, per Ti. Neronem tradere, qui tum mihi privignus erat. Et eandem gentem postea desciscentem et rebellantem domitam per Gaium filium meum regi Ariobarzani regis Medorum Artabazi filio regendam tradidi et post eius mortem filio eius Artavasdi. Quo interfecto Tigrane(m), qui erat ex regio genere Armeniorum oriundus, in id regnum misi.*

15. 2–13. Ἀρμενίαν τὴν μείζονα ἀναιρεθέντος τοῦ

βασιλέως δυνάμενος ἐπαρχείαν ποῆσαι μᾶλλον ἐβουλήθην κατὰ τὰ πάτρια ἡμῶν ἔθη βασιλείαν Τιγράνῃ Ἀρταουάσδου υἱῷ, υἱωνῷ δὲ Τιγράνου βασιλέως δοῦναι διὰ Τιβερίου Νέρωνος, ὃς τότ' ἐμοῦ πρόγονος ἦν. Καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἔθνος ἀφιστάμενον καὶ ἀναπολεμοῦν δαμασθὲν ὑπὸ Γαΐου τοῦ υἱοῦ μου βασιλεῖ Ἀριοβαρζάνει, βασιλέως Μήδων Ἀρταβάζου υἱῷ, παρέδωκα καὶ μετὰ τὸν ἐκείνου θάνατον τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ Ἀρταουάσδῃ· οὗ ἀναιρεθέντος Τιγράνην, ὃς ἦν ἐκ γένους Ἀρμενίου βασιλικοῦ, εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν ἔπεμψα.

Greater Armenia, on the murder of its king Artaxes, I could have made into a province, but I preferred, following the precedent of our ancestors, and acting through Tiberius Nero, who was then my stepson, to hand it over as a kingdom to Tigranes, son of king Artavasdes, and grandson of king Tigranes. Afterwards, when the same race revolted and rebelled, I subdued it by means of my son, Gaius, and handed it over to the rule of king Ariobarzanes, the son of Artabazus, king of the Medes; and after his death, to his son, Artavasdes. On the latter being killed, I sent out to the kingdom Tigranes, a scion of the royal family of Armenia.

Augustus after Actium found relations in the far East complicated by the ill-considered policy and actions of Antony. In the campaign of 36 B. C. Artavasdes, king of Armenia, and son of the more famous Tigranes, had been an ally of Antony, but had failed him at the critical point (Plut. *Ant.* 50; Dio Cass. 49. 25). A year later Antony had contrived treacherously to seize Artavasdes, and sent him with his three sons, Artaxes, Tigranes, and another to Egypt, where he was put to death by Cleopatra. The object of the crime was to provide a kingdom for Alexander, son of Antony and Cleopatra, who was married to a daughter of another Artavasdes, king of

Media Atropatene (Dio Cass. 49. 40 and 44). Artaxes, however, the eldest son, had escaped from Egypt, and as the attention of Antony was soon called to the situation in the West, he was able to secure the kingdom of Armenia (Joseph. *Ant. Jud.* 15. 4. 3). It was not for a year or two, however, that Artaxes was firmly established in Armenia, Artavasdes of Media, who in Antony's interest had attacked him, being taken prisoner by the Parthians (Dio Cass. 49. 44). Under him, therefore, Armenia was a kingdom hostile to Rome, and in alliance with Parthia. Tacitus (*Ann.* 2. 3) describes Armenia as *infida ob scelus Antonii, qui Artavasden regem Armeniorum specie amicitiae inlectum, dein catenis oneratum, postremo interfecerat.*

This was the situation which Augustus had to face after Actium. *Eius filius Artaxias memoria patris nobis infensus Arsacidarum vi seque regnumque tutatus est.* With regard to Armenia, there were three courses open to Augustus. He might conquer and annex it, or leave it independent and hostile, or restore the client relationship established thirty-six years before by Pompey. The first course would certainly have involved a war with Parthia; the third might have done so at the time, and for this Augustus was not prepared. He accordingly left Artaxes alone for the present, but took his two brothers back to Rome, and as a menace to his Western frontier, he made the Mede Artavasdes, who had fled to him from Parthia (see below, VI. 1), king of Armenia Minor, a fact proved by a statement of Dio under the year 20 B. C. that Augustus gave Armenia Minor to Archelaus of Cappadocia, ὅτι ὁ Μῆδος ὁ πρὶν αὐτῆς βασιλεύων ἐτεθνήκει (54. 9). At the same time, as a possible menace to Phraates, he kept Tiridates, a refugee claimant to the Arsacid throne (V. 54), and who had been played off against Phraates by Antony, ready at hand in Syria.

Things remained in this position till 20 B. C., when Augustus, who had spent the winter of 21 B. C. in Samos, determined on

the deposition of Artaxes. It appears from Dio that the romanizing party in Armenia invited intervention, and begged for the king's brother Tigranes to be sent out from Rome. Τῶν Ἀρμενίων τῶν ἑτέρων (those in Greater Armenia) τοῦ τε Ἀρταβάζου κατηγορησάντων καὶ τὸν Τιγράνην τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ὄντα μεταπεμψαμένων, μετέστειλε τὸν Τιβέριον, ὅπως τὸν μὲν ἐκβάλῃ τῆς βασιλείας, τὸν δὲ ἐς αὐτὴν ἀποκαταστήσῃ (54. 9). But, Dio goes on, ἐπράχθη μὲν οὐδὲν τῆς παρασκευῆς αὐτοῦ ἄξιον. οἱ γὰρ Ἀρμένιοι τὸν Ἀρταβάζην προαπέκτειναν. Tacitus says that Artaxias was killed *per dolum propinquorum*. Nevertheless, Tiberius entered Armenia with an army (Vell. 2. 94), and *datus a Caesare Armeniis Tigranes deductusque in regnum a Tiberio Nerone* (*Ann.* 2. 3). Suetonius (*Tib.* 9) says that Tiberius with his own hands *pro tribunali diadema imposuit*, and as Pompey had done exactly the same to the first Tigranes in 66 B.C., this was doubtless, as Mommsen suggests, the *exemplum maiorum nostrorum* to which Augustus appeals. It was probably at this time that the Medes of Atropatene, released from the rule of Artaxes, petitioned Augustus for a king (VI. 9), and that he sent out Ariobarzanes, a son of their former king Artavasdes.

Thus Augustus committed himself to the intermediate policy of making Armenia a client kingdom, regardless of the fact that *ingenio hominum et situ terrarum* Armenia was bound to have Parthian more often than Roman sympathies. There was no doubt a fairly strong romanizing party in the country, but it was left without military support, and again and again proved unequal to the national or Parthian faction. The statement of Augustus, when examined, is a confession of failure and disappointment.

Augustus passes over in silence the interval between the installation of Tigranes and the mission of Gaius Caesar, though the words *desciscentem et rebellantem* clearly point to failure and confusion. Tacitus partly fills the gap: *Nec Tigrani diuturnum imperium fuit, neque liberis eius, quamquam sociatis more*

externo in matrimonium regnumque. Dein iussu Augusti impositus Artavasdes, et non sine clade nostra deiectus (*Ann.* 2. 3). The children of Tigranes were Tigranes III and Erato, who in Oriental fashion were married and shared the throne. They appear to have favoured the Parthian faction, and on that account Augustus set up Artavasdes, probably the third son of the first Artavasdes, whom Augustus had taken to Rome with Tigranes (Dio Cass. 51. 16). The details of the expulsion of Artavasdes are not known, and Augustus passes over the whole episode as discreditable to Roman prestige. It probably took place in 6 B. C., when Dio (55. 9) speaks of Armenia as ἀλλοτριουμένη, and says that Tiberius refused a second mission to the East (cf. also Vell. 2. 110). There can be little doubt that Tigranes and Erato were restored by the Parthian party, and that Armenia was under anti-Roman rule till Gaius Caesar was sent out in 1 B. C. Tacitus says: *Tum Gaius Caesar componendae Armeniae deligitur. Is Ariobarzanen origine Medum ob insignem corporis formam et praeclarum animum volentibus Armeniis praefecit. Ariobarzane morte fortuita absumpto stirpem eius haud toleravere, temptatoque feminae imperio, cui nomen Erato, eaque brevi pulsa, incerti solutique et magis sine domino quam in libertate profugum Vononen in regnum accipiunt* (*Ann.* 2. 4). It appears from Dio (55. 11) that Tigranes, no doubt aware that decisive steps were about to be taken, sent a letter to Augustus, begging to be recognized as king, and that Augustus advised him to visit Gaius in Syria. Before the arrival of Gaius, however, he lost his life, and as Erato withdrew, the throne was vacant. The selection of Ariobarzanes, son of Artavasdes king of Atropatene and afterwards of Armenia Minor, was no doubt due to political rather than to the personal reasons given by Tacitus. The phrase of Tacitus, *volentibus Armeniis*, is somewhat discounted by the *domitam* of Augustus, and still more by the fact that Gaius had to use his military forces, and was, indeed, fatally wounded in the siege of Artagira. The fact that Ariobarzanes was succeeded

by his son Artabazes, left uncertain by the words of Tacitus (*haud toleravere*), is confirmed by Dio (55. 10 *a*), *τὴν Ἀρμενίαν τότε μὲν ὁ Ἀριοβαρζάνης, ἀποθανόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ οὐ πολλῷ ὕστερον Ἀρταβάζης ὁ υἱὸς παρά τε τοῦ Αὐγούστου καὶ παρὰ τῆς βουλῆς ἔλαβεν.* Whether, after the murder of Artabazes, Erato was for a short time restored by the Parthian party, or whether Tacitus has made a mistake, is perhaps doubtful, but, as her restoration would have been another rebuff to Rome, Augustus had a motive for omitting it. He concludes his statement with the sending out of a fourth Tigranes, whose rule was clearly so brief that Tacitus omits him, and whose Armenian connexion seems to have been of the slightest.[1] Of the events in Armenia during the last ten years or so of his reign Augustus gives no record. It was in A. D. 10 that Vonones, driven from the Parthian throne, to which Augustus had sent him, by the accession of Artabanus, took refuge in Armenia, and was apparently accepted as king by the romanizing party. Whether Vonones was recognized by Augustus or not, the mention of him as king of Armenia would have recalled the failure to maintain him as king of Parthia. It was not till the mission of Germanicus in A. D. 17 that Roman ascendency in Armenia was regained.

V. 31–34. *Provincias omnis quae trans Hadrianum mare vergunt ad orientem, Cyrenasque, iam ex parte magna regibus eas possidentibus, et antea Siciliam et Sardiniam occupatas bello servili reciperavi.*

15. 13–17. *Ἐπαρχείας ἁπάσας ὅσαι πέραν τοῦ Εἰονίου κόλπου διατείνουσι πρὸς ἀνατολάς, καὶ Κυρήνην ἐκ μείζονος μέρους ὑπὸ βασιλέων κατεσχημένας καὶ ἔμπροσθεν Σικελίαν καὶ Σαρδὼ προκατειλημένας πολέμῳ δουλικῷ ἀνέλαβον.*

[1] Tigranes was a son of Alexander, son of Herod and of a daughter of Archelaus of Cappadocia. The Armenian connexion must have come from the wife of Archelaus, the maternal grandmother of Tigranes. He is probably referred to in Tac. *Ann.* 6. 40.

I regained possession of all the provinces on the farther side of the Hadriatic towards the East and of all Cyrene, at a time when they were for the most part in the occupation of foreign kings, as I had already regained Sicily and Sardinia, when they were seized in the servile war.

What Augustus states is that he recovered all the provinces which had fallen to Antony by the treaty of Brundisium or had been seized by Sex. Pompeius, and that of the former class large portions were in the hands of kings. Antony's provinces had been Macedonia, Achaea, Bithynia-Pontus, Asia (of which no portions had been handed over to kings), Cilicia, Cyprus, Crete, Cyrene, and Syria. Practically all the last-named provinces had been transferred by Antony to Cleopatra or to kings of his own creation, and were therefore withdrawn from the Roman empire. From Cilicia, Pamphylia and Lycaonia with Pisidia were given to Amyntas, now made king of Galatia to the exclusion of the family of Deiotarus (Dio Cass. 49. 32). Cyprus, too, which under the republic had belonged to Cilicia, was now surrendered to the claims of Egypt (Plut. *Ant.* 54; Strabo, p. 685). With yet another district of the province made over to Cleopatra, if Strabo (p. 669) is correct, very little of Cilicia was left. Syria was still more recklessly dealt with. Not only was Coele-Syria handed over to Cleopatra (Plut. *Ant.* 54; Joseph. *Ant. Jud.* 15. 3. 8), and the Syrian coast-line with the exception of Tyre and Sidon (Dio Cass. 49. 32), together with the outlying districts of Ituraea, Judaea, and Nabataea (Dio Cass. 49. 32; Joseph. ib. 15. 4. 1), but all the rest of Syria was re-established as an independent kingdom under Ptolemy Philadelphus, one of his own sons by Cleopatra (Plut. loc. cit.). Lastly, when Plutarch includes Λιβύη among the regions given to Cleopatra, he no doubt means the Roman province of Cyrene. The huge Oriental kingdom which was to have been established for the other son of Antony and Cleopatra, Alexander, though highly characteristic of Antony's

policy, did not include any provincial territory. Dio Cassius, indeed, declares that Alexander was to have ruled from the Euphrates to the Hellespont (49. 41). But Plutarch gives a far more probable account of the intended kingdom, making it consist of Armenia, Media Atropatene, and Parthia. The occupation of Sicily and Sardinia by Sex. Pompeius and the description of the war against him as a servile war or a war against pirates has been referred to under V. 1 foll.

CAP. XXVIII

V. 35–36. *Colonias in Africa Sicilia Macedonia utraque Hispania Achaia Asia Syria Gallia Narbonensi Pisidia militum deduxi.*

15. 18–20. *Ἀποικίας ἐν Λιβύῃ Σικελίᾳ Μακεδονίᾳ ἐν ἑκατέρα τε Ἱσπανίᾳ Ἀχαίᾳ Ἀσίᾳ Συρίᾳ Γαλατίᾳ τῇ περὶ Νάρβωνα Πισιδίᾳ στρατιωτῶν κατήγαγον.*

I established colonies of my soldiers in Africa, Sicily, Macedonia, in both Spanish provinces, in Achaea, Asia, Syria, Gallia Narbonensis, and Pisidia.

We have already had a reference to the military colonization of Augustus in connexion with the sums paid by him for land in the provinces and in Italy (see above, on III. 22 ff.). Augustus here refers only to military colonies, and there is no evidence that he followed Caesar's example in sending out colonists from the civil population of Rome. At the same time it is possible that, having done this in a few cases early in his career, and having found the step unpopular, he may have deliberately omitted it from his record. Mommsen calls attention to the fact that Illyricum is not mentioned in this list, although there is reason to think that as a result of the campaigns from 36 to 33 B. C. Salonae, Narona, Iader, and Emona became colonies. If these were military colonies, the omission of Illyricum (which, if not a separate province, was certainly

within the provincial system), seems inexplicable.[1] But, if Octavian had taken the opportunity of providing for some of the Roman population, or perhaps for some of the Italians dispossessed by the agrarian measures after Philippi, the omission can reasonably be accounted for.

In Africa, to take the provinces specified by Augustus, Carthage, to which Caesar had sent mainly civilian colonists, may now have been constituted a military colony. In Sicily there were three colonies, Panormus, Thermae, and Tyndaris (Marqdt. *Staatsver.* i, p. 246). In Macedonia we know from Dio Cassius (51. 4) that dispossessed Italians were sent out as colonists in 29 B. C. to Dyrrachium and Philippi. These were of course not military colonies, though occasioned by a military colonization, but veterans may well have been sent to both at a later date, as they certainly were to Philippi (Marqdt. ib. i, p. 320). In the case of Spain, Pliny, whose account of these provinces represents the state of things under Augustus, gives eight for Baetica, twelve for Tarraconensis, and five for Lusitania, and though many of these were founded by Caesar, a substantial remainder were Augustan colonies, Caesar-Augusta being the most conspicuous in the Hither province, Emerita in the Further. Little importance need be attached to the fact that Augustus still uses the phrase *utraque Hispania*, although after 15 B. C., if not earlier, the Further province had been divided into Baetica and Lusitania, the former being a public province, the latter a *provincia Caesaris*. Inscriptions prove that the terms Citerior and Ulterior had not gone entirely out of use (see Dessau, 1016), and Augustus, who is only making a general statement, found the old comprehensive phrase a convenient one. In Achaea, Patrae was certainly a colony of veteran legionaries (*C. I. L.* iii, p. 95), while Tacitus (*Ann.* 5. 10) speaks of Nicopolis as a *colonia*. If, however, the latter had

[1] Mommsen seems to forget that, if Illyricum is omitted, as not being a separate province, Pisidia should have been omitted for the same reason.

a nucleus of military colonists, they must have been soon swamped in the *συνοικισμός* of surrounding districts into the territory of this commemorative colony.[1] In Asia Alexandria in Troas was a military colony (Pliny, *N. H.* 5. 124), while in Syria there was at least Berytus (Strabo, 16, p. 756). In Gallia Narbonensis the establishment of the Italian urban organization was due to Iulius Caesar, and almost all the *coloniae Iuliae* were his creations. But even if Augustus founded no new colonies, and this may have been so, he probably sent out fresh veterans to colonies already established, and may also have elevated Latin towns like Aquae Sextiae into Roman colonies, accompanying or accomplishing the change of status by the settlement of legionary veterans. The military colonies in Pisidia, Antioch, Olbasa, Comana, Parlaïs, and Cremna, are interesting as a new method of pacifying restless and unsubdued tribes. Those in the mountains of Pisidia and Lycaonia had long defied all the usual modes of suppression. On forming the province of Galatia in 25 B.C., Augustus had detached these districts from Cilicia, and placed them under the *legatus* of the new province, but instead of continuing the never-ending task of military suppression, he dominated the disturbed zone by this girdle of military colonies (see Mommsen, *Provinces*, i, pp. 336 ff.). We have already seen that in 13 B.C. the system of rewarding veterans with lands in colonies was replaced, or was to have been replaced, by money payments on their *honesta missio*.

V. 36–38. *Italia autem XXVIII colonias, quae vivo me celeberrimae et frequentissimae fuerunt, meis auspicis deductas habet.*

15. 20–22. *Ἰταλία δὲ εἴκοσι ὀκτὼ ἀποικίας ἔχει ὑπ' ἐμοῦ καταχθείσας, αἳ ἐμοῦ περιόντος πληθύουσαι ἐτύγχανον.*

Italy, moreover, possesses eight-and-twenty colonies

[1] For both Nicopolis and Patrae see Arnold, *Studies in Roman Imperialism*, pp. 196 ff.

established under my auspices, which in my lifetime had large and prosperous populations.

Suetonius (*Aug.* 46) repeats the assertion: *Italiam duodetriginta coloniarum numero deductarum a se frequentavit.* Mommsen, who is much exercised by the omission of Illyricum from the previous statement, seems not disinclined to accept the suggestion that Augustus finds it convenient here to make Italy include Illyricum. If, it is suggested, Augustus was unable to fulfil his promise of finding Italian land for all his soldiers, he may have fallen back on colonies in Illyricum for some of them, and in that case would have had good reason for not recording the fact. To this it seems obvious to reply that, if at the time Augustus could have made soldiers settled in Illyricum believe that they were settled in Italy, it might have suited his purpose, but that he should have perpetuated so futile a contrivance in an official record forty-three years later is surely incredible. Italy, therefore, must mean Italy as extended to the Alps after 42 B. C. We may assume with some confidence that the twenty-eight colonies included not only those resulting from the settlement of 29 B. C. alluded to in III. 18, but also those colonies which after Philippi had been the foundations of Octavian as distinct from those of Antony. The colonies were perhaps in no case new communities, but were either towns from which the old possessors had been expelled, or which were enlarged and dominated by numerous military colonists, or were older colonies, like Minturnae or Parma, which now became *coloniae Iuliae* or *Augustae* on the ground of new veteran soldiers being settled in them (see the passage of Hyginus cited on p. 82). Mommsen gives the following list of Italian towns which on the evidence of inscriptions were colonies with the titles of Iulia or Augusta or both: 1. Ariminum; 2. Ateste; 3. Augusta Praetoria; 4. Augusta Taurinorum; 5. Beneventum; 6. Bononia; 7. Brixia; 8. Capua; 9. Castrum Novum; 10. Concordia; 11. Cumae; 12. Dertona;

13. Fanum Fortunae; 14. Falerium; 15. Hispellum; 16. Lucus Feroniae; 17. Minturnae; 18. Nola; 19. Parentium; 20. Parma; 21. Pisae; 22. Pisaurum; 23. Pola; 24. Saena; 25. Sora; 26. Suessa; 27. Sutrium; 28. Tuder; 29. Venafrum. To these Mommsen adds, in accordance with the hypothesis criticized above, the Illyrian colonies, Emona, Iader, and Salonae. Without laying too much stress on the coincidence between the twenty-nine of Mommsen and the twenty-eight of Augustus, we may be sure that with few exceptions the twenty-eight flourishing and populous colonies of Italy have been identified.

CAP. XXIX

V. 39–40. *Signa militaria complura per alios duces amissa devictis hostibus reciperavi ex Hispania et Gallia et a Dalmateis.*

15. 23–24—16. 1–2. Σημέας στρατιωτικὰς πολλὰς ὑπὸ ἄλλων ἡγεμόνων ἀποβεβλημένας νεικήσας πολεμίους ἀπέλαβον ἐξ Ἱσπανίας καὶ Γαλατίας καὶ παρὰ Δαλματῶν.

A number of military standards lost by other leaders were recovered by me, after conquering the enemy, from Spain and Gaul and from the Dalmatians.

No notice of any disaster in Spain or Gaul for which Augustus exacted punishment and the restoration of lost standards has survived. We know, indeed, from Velleius (2. 97) that in 16 B.C. Lollius lost a legion in Germany, and that this was the occasion for a visit of Augustus to Gaul, but there is no statement that the eagle of the legion was recovered. Appian, however, gives an interesting confirmation of the statement concerning the Dalmatae (*Illyr.* 12. 25 and 28). During his command in Gaul Caesar had sent a force to protect the Liburni against the Dalmatae, which had been defeated. Later, when Gabinius was leading a force round the Hadriatic to join Caesar in Epirus, his army was

destroyed and his standards taken. These Octavian recovered in the course of his Dalmatian campaigns.

V. 40–43. *Parthos trium exercitum Romanorum spolia et signa reddere mihi supplicesque amicitiam populi Romani petere coegi. Ea autem signa in penetrali, quod est in templo Martis Vltoris, reposui.*

16. 2–6. *Πάρθους τριῶν στρατευμάτων Ῥωμαίων σκῦλα καὶ σημέας ἀποδοῦναι ἐμοὶ ἱκέτας τε φιλίαν δήμου Ῥωμαίων ἀξιῶσαι ἠνάγκασα. Ταύτας δὲ τὰς σημέας ἐν τῷ Ἄρεως τοῦ Ἀμύντορος ναοῦ ἀδύτῳ ἀπεθέμην.*

The Parthians I compelled to restore the spoils and standards of three Roman armies, and as suppliants to implore the friendship of the Roman people. The standards I placed in the inner shrine of the temple of Mars Ultor.

Fortunately for Rome the Parthian kings were constantly diverted from the affairs of their Western frontier by trouble in other parts of their heterogeneous empire. Thus in 20 B.C., when Augustus from Syria determined on a settlement of the Armenian and Parthian question, Phraates was not prepared to risk a war with Rome. Tiberius, as we have seen, was able to make Armenia into a client kingdom without using his armed forces, and when that was accomplished, Phraates was all the less in a position to defy Augustus. He therefore in consequence of diplomatic representations from Tiberius surrendered the eagles taken from Crassus and Antony, and also, though Augustus passes it over in silence, some surviving captives. Dio declares (54. 8) *Κἀν τούτῳ ὁ Φραάτης φοβηθεὶς μὴ καὶ ἐπιστρατεύσῃ οἱ, ὅτι μηδέπω τῶν συγκειμένων ἐπεποιήκει τι, τά τε σημεῖα αὐτῷ καὶ τοὺς αἰχμαλώτους . . . ἀπέπεμψεν. καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖνος ὡς καὶ πολέμῳ τινὶ τὸν Πάρθον νενικηκὼς ἔλαβεν.* Velleius (2. 91), Suetonius (*Aug.* 21), and Livy (*Epit.* 139) make similar but shorter statements. All these authorities except Dio agree that the eagles restored had been lost not

only in 54 B. C., when Crassus lost his army and his life at Carrhae, but also in the Parthian wars of Antony. Indeed, the words *trium exercituum* show that Antony must have incurred two disasters. This is also implied by Horace in an ode written in 28 B. C.: *Iam bis Monaeses et Pacori manus non auspicatos contudit impetus nostros* (3. 6). The two occasions were when Decidius Saxa suffered defeat at the hands of Pacorus in 40 B. C., and Oppius Statianus lost two legions in 36 B. C. It is probable that, in using the expressions *coegi* and *supplices*, Augustus is guilty of some exaggeration thirty-four years after the event. But it appears from Horace (*Epist.* 1. 12. 27) that it was the popular, or perhaps the court view at the time: *Ius imperiumque Phraates Caesaris accepit genibus minor.* Coins suggest the same thing, partly by their legends, still more by the figures of suppliant Parthians, &c., engraved on them. Conf. especially Cohen, *Aug. n.* 82–85 *civib. et sign. milit. a Parth. recuper.* The standards were transferred to the temple of Mars Ultor on the dedication of that temple in 2 B. C. At first they were placed in the Capitol, where they clearly were when Horace wrote. Dio (loc. cit.) mistakenly speaks of νεὼν Ἄρεως Τιμωροῦ ἐν τῷ Καπιτωλίῳ.

CAP. XXX

V. 44–49. *Pannoniorum gentes quas ante me principem populi Romani exercitus nunquam adit, devictas per Ti. Neronem, qui tum erat privignus et legatus meus, imperio populi Romani subiecci protulique fines Illyrici ad ripam fluminis Danui. Citra quod Dacorum transgressus exercitus meis auspicis victus profligatusque est, et postea trans Danuvium ductus exercitus meus Dacorum gentes imperia populi Romani perferre coegit.*

16. 7–14. Παννονίων ἔθνη, οἷς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἡγεμόνος στράτευμα Ῥωμαίων οὐκ ἤνγισεν, ἡσσηθέντα ὑπὸ Τιβερίου

Νέρωνος, ὃς τότ' ἐμοῦ ἦν πρόγονος καὶ πρεσβευτής, ἡγεμονίᾳ δήμου Ῥωμαίων ὑπέταξα, τά τε Ἰλλυρικοῦ ὅρια μέχρι Ἴστρου ποταμοῦ προήγαγον· οὗ ἐπείταδε Δάκων διαβᾶσα πολλὴ δύναμις ἐμοῖς αἰσίοις οἰωνοῖς κατεκόπη. Καὶ ὕστερον μεταχθὲν τὸ ἐμὸν στράτευμα πέραν Ἴστρου τὰ Δάκων ἔθνη προστάγματα δήμου Ῥωμαίων ὑπομένειν ἠνάγκασεν.

By means of Tiberius Nero, who was then my stepson and legate, I conquered the tribes of the Pannonians and subjected them to the empire of the Roman people, whereas before my principate an army of the Roman people had never reached them; and I extended the frontiers of Illyricum to the bank of the river Danube.

An army of the Dacians having crossed to our side of the river was conquered and destroyed under my auspices, and later on, my army having crossed the Danube, compelled the tribes of the Dacians to submit to the commands of the Roman people.

The first portion of this statement refers to the forward and aggressive policy adopted in the Danube region from 13 B.C. onward. Till that date the situation on the middle and lower Danube had been as it was left after the Dalmatian campaigns of 36–33 B.C. and the expeditions of Licinius Crassus in 29 B.C. But in both cases it was temporary and tentative, and when the Italian frontier had been settled by the creation of Noricum and Raetia in 15 B.C., Augustus took up again the further security of Illyricum. Agrippa was to have been entrusted with the task, but on his death in 12 B.C. Tiberius was sent out as legatus of Illyricum, the new departure being marked by the inclusion of that region among the *provinciae Caesaris*. During four campaigns, 12 to 9 B.C., the military occupation was extended along the valleys of the Save and the Drave, tribes like the Breuci were conquered,

and a strong military outpost established at Poetovio near the Norican frontier. If, as the collocation of the clause suggests, the extension of Illyricum to the Danube was also the work of Tiberius, the words must be taken to refer to political influence and not to military occupation, as there is no indication that Roman armies reached the Danube at this time, and there was certainly no permanent camp along the river. I have sometimes thought, however, that the phrase *fines Illyrici* may be used in a wider and vaguer sense, and that Augustus may be referring to the creation of the province of Moesia which almost certainly belongs to about the same time, and which borders the lower Danube. What seems perhaps in favour of this view is that the remainder of the present statement is concerned with events on the Moesian frontier.

The last two expeditions commemorated by Augustus belong to the frontier warfare along the lower Danube. Among numerous smaller affairs of the same sort these seem to have stood out as landmarks. The danger from Dacia which culminated under Domitian goes back at any rate to the time of Caesar. It was in his time, as we know from Strabo (pp. 298 and 303), that Boerebistas, king of the Daci or Getae, organized his kingdom into a formidable empire, crossed the Danube, overrunning Thrace, and even threatened the Romans nearer Italy. Caesar had planned a decisive expedition to remove this danger and to establish a secure frontier in this direction, but, like the Parthian expedition, it was prevented by his death. Fortunately for Rome, on the death of Boerebistas his empire was split up, but in the civil wars we find Cotiso, king of the Getae, on the side of Antony, and it was one of the ulterior objects of Octavian in undertaking his campaigns in Illyricum (36 to 33 B.C.) to give effect to Caesar's policy. He, however, did no more than establish Siscia as a future base of operations against the Daci and Bastarnae. The next step was taken in 30 and 29 B.C., when Licinius Crassus in conquering the

greater part of Moesia drove both Moesians and Dacians across the Danube. After this, the alarm conjured up by the picture of *coniurato descendens Dacus ab Istro* was dissipated, but the Dacians were still troublesome and even dangerous. Among what were probably frequent raids across the frozen Danube we hear of one in 16 B.C. (Dio Cass. 54. 20) and a more serious one in 10 B.C. The latter is probably the first of the two occasions mentioned here by Augustus. Dio (54. 36) states: οἱ Δακοὶ τὸν Ἴστρον πεπηγότα διαβάντες λείαν ἐκ τῆς Παννονίας ἀπετέμοντο. This was while the campaigns of Tiberius in Illyricum were going on, and the annihilation of this raiding expedition was one of his successes. It is not impossible that this affair and the circumstances of which it was typical led to the creation of the province of Moesia, which, as already stated, must be attributed to this period. The second expedition was clearly on a larger scale, and the Dacians, helped apparently by Sarmatae, were attacked on their own side of the Danube. Suetonius (*Aug.* 21) says: *coercuit et Dacorum incursiones, tribus eorum ducibus cum magna copia caesis.* The date is not given, but Strabo (p. 304) speaks of a recent expedition, καὶ δὴ καὶ νῦν, ἡνίκα ἔπεμψεν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς στρατείαν ὁ Σεβαστὸς Καῖσαρ. It seems tempting to connect this overthrow of the Dacians with the *triumphalia de Getis* which Tacitus (*Ann.* 4. 44) mentions in recording the death of C. Cornelius Lentulus, the augur, in A.D. 25. This is confirmed by Florus, who in an apparently well-informed passage (iv. 12) says: *visum est Caesari Augusto gentem aditu difficillimam summovere; misso igitur Lentulo ultra ulteriorem reppulit ripam. Sic tum Dacia non victa sed summota atque dilata est.* Lentulus was consul in 14 B.C., and was no doubt legate of Moesia at the time of the expedition. Mommsen may be right in assigning it to A.D. 6, in which year Dio (55. 30) mentions hostilities with the Dacians and Sarmatae. He also suggests that the settlement of 80,000 Dacians on the right bank of the Danube by Aelius Catus, mentioned by Strabo

(loc. cit.) may have been a consequence of their defeat. This would make the date later than A. D. 4, since Catus was consul in that year, and was probably legate of Moesia when he took this action.

CAP. XXXI

V. 50–51. *Ad me ex India regum legationes saepe missae sunt, nunquam antea visae apud quemquam Romanorum ducem.*

16. 16–18. *Πρὸς ἐμὲ ἐξ Ἰνδίας βασιλέων πρεσβεῖαι πολλάκις ἀπεστάλησαν, οὐδέποτε πρὸ τούτου χρόνου ὀφθεῖσαι παρὰ Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμόνι.*

From India embassies of kings, never before seen in the camp of any Roman general, were many times sent to me.

Suetonius (*Aug.* 21) ascribes the initiative to Augustus: *Indos etiam ac Scythas, auditu modo cognitos, pellexit ad amicitiam suam populique Romani . . . petendam.* Florus adds that the envoys brought presents of precious stones, pearls, and elephants. The motive of Augustus in encouraging this intercourse must have been commercial, and it is perhaps not an accident that Orosius places one embassy during the absence of Augustus at Tarraco in 26 or 25 B.C., while Dio (54. 9) speaks of another as reaching him during his stay at Samos in 20 B.C. Both dates are significantly near the Arabian expedition discussed above, which was certainly connected with the Red Sea trade with the far East.

V. 51–53. *Nostram amicitiam petierunt per legatos Bastarnae Scythaeque et Sarmatarum qui sunt citra flumen Tanaim et ultra reges, Albanorumque rex et Hiberorum et Medorum.*

16. 18–22. *Τὴν ἡμετέραν φιλίαν ἠξίωσαν διὰ πρέσβεων*

Βαστάρναι καὶ Σκύθαι καὶ Σαρματῶν οἱ ἐπίταδε ὄντες τοῦ Τανάιδος ποταμοῦ καὶ οἱ πέραν δὲ βασιλεῖς, καὶ Ἀλβανῶν δὲ καὶ Ἰβήρων καὶ Μήδων βασιλέες.

Our friendship was sought through ambassadors by the Bastarnae and Scythians and by the kings of the Sarmatae who live on both sides of the river Tanais, and by the kings of the Albani and Iberi and Medi.

The Sarmatae and Scythians Suetonius has mentioned in combination with the Indians, but the other tribes here named may be included under the statement (loc. cit.) *quorundam barbarorum principes in aede Martis Vltoris coegit iurare mansuros se in fide ac pace quam peterent.* It is safe to say that in the case of the three tribes first mentioned the oath of friendship or clientship, if it was ever taken, was not kept. They were all dangerous and aggressive races, constantly troubling the Moesian frontier, and all are specially mentioned in the *titulus* of Plautius Aelianus, legate of Moesia under Nero, as having to be pacified or put down (Dessau, 986). Probably the sweeping victories of Crassus in 29 B.C. compelled these tribes for the moment to submit and to send envoys to Rome. The *citra* and *ultra Tanaim* as applied to the Sarmatae is confirmed by a comparison of Strabo, p. 128, and Tac. *Ann.* 6. 33. The relations of Media Atropatene and its kings to Augustus have already been dealt with. The friendship with the Albani and Iberi was probably far more effective, though we know only from Augustus himself that it dated from his own policy. Together with the Colchi, they occupied the region of the Caucasus. We know from Dio (49. 24) that they were conquered by Antony in 36 B.C., and they no doubt transferred their allegiance to Augustus after Actium. They formed the extreme northern end of the chain of client kingdoms, by which, as at first arranged, the Eastern frontier was to be protected. The Iberi under their king Pharasmanes played a not unimportant part in the Armenian wars under Claudius

and Nero, and were always of value as supplying useful light cavalry.

CAP. XXXII

V. 54—VI. 1–3. *Ad me supplices confugerunt reges Parthorum Tiridates et postea Phrates regis Phratis filius; Medorum Artavasdes; Adiabenorum Artaxares; Britannorum Dumnobellaunus et Tim . . .; Sugambrorum Maelo; Marcomanorum Sucborum . . . . . rus.*

16. 23, 24—17. 1–4. *Πρὸς ἐμὲ ἱκέται κατέφυγον βασιλεῖς Πάρθων μὲν Τειριδάτης καὶ μετέπειτα Φραάτης βασιλέως Φράτου υἱός, Μήδων δὲ Ἀρταουάσδης, Ἀδιαβηνῶν Ἀρταξάρης, Βριτανν<u>ῶ</u>ν Δομνοελλαῦνος καὶ Τιμ . . ., Σουγάμβρων Μαίλων, Μαρκομάνων Σουήβων . . . . . ρος.*

Among kings who fled to me as suppliants were Tiridates and Phraates son of king Phraates, kings of the Parthians; Artavasdes king of the Medes; Artaxares king of the Adiabeni; Dumnobellaunus and Tim . . . kings of the Britanni; Maclo king of the Sugambri, and . . . . . rus king of the Marcomanni Suebi.

We know from Dio Cassius (51. 18) that in 36 B.C. Tiridates was set up as king by the disaffected Parthians in the place of Phraates. He retained a precarious possession of the kingdom till 30 B.C., when Phraates with the help of the Scythians regained the kingdom, and Tiridates fled to Syria. Augustus, in spite of the remonstrances of Phraates, allowed him to remain there, but refused to support his pretentions to the Parthian throne. There is more difficulty about Phraates, son of the king. According to the account followed by Justin, Tiridates kidnapped and brought with him to Augustus at Tarraco (i.e. in 26 or 25 B.C.) Phraates the king's youngest son, whereas Dio says that he took him to Syria in 30 B.C., and that Augustus carried him to Rome as a hostage. Mommsen thinks that the

two accounts may be reconciled by accepting Dio's date for the expulsion of Tiridates, but supposing that he somehow got possession of the young Phraates a few years later, and took him to Augustus in Spain. The fact that Phraates was one of the four sons sent to Rome in 9 B.C. (see below) is no difficulty, since Dio mentions under the year 23 B.C. (53. 33) an embassy from Phraates to Augustus, demanding the surrender of Tiridates and his son, and states that the latter was restored to his father. But according to both versions the young Phraates was not king, and did not flee to Augustus as a suppliant. Another suggestion is that it was really Phreataces, the successor of Phraates, who according to a brief statement of Josephus (*Ant. Jud.* 18. 2. 4) was ejected from the kingdom. But it is nowhere stated that he fled to Augustus. Here the difficulty must be left, with the remark that the word *postea* seems to require a certain interval between the advent of Tiridates and Phraates. The latter was afterwards sent out by Tiberius in A.D. 35 as a pretender to the Parthian crown (Tac. *Ann.* 6. 31–2). Reference has already been made to the reception by Augustus of Artavasdes of Media Atropatene, and his subsequent installation as king of Armenia Minor. The king of the Adiabeni, a tribe on the upper Tigris (cf. *Ann.* 12. 13), may probably have taken refuge with Augustus about the same time. The mention of the two British kings is interesting, but obscure. At two periods, viz. 34 B.C. and 27–26 B.C., there was much talk and some real preparation for an expedition to Britain. But though Virgil and Horace in many familiar passages anticipate the result of the expedition and speak as if the conquest was an accomplished fact, it was never really attempted (Dio Cass. 49. 38; 53. 22 and 25). A well-known passage of Strabo (p. 200) while mentioning the visit of British chieftains to Augustus, states what no doubt were the official reasons for not making Britain a province. It is clear that there were close and continuous economic and commercial relations with the island. Coins with the name

Dubnovellaunus, and possibly the abbreviation for Tincommius have been found in Kent and Essex, and almost certainly both kings reigned over the Trinobantes. It is even possible that they were in a client or semi-client relation to Rome. As to the Sigambri, Strabo (p. 291) testifies to a king named Melon. They gave trouble together with other tribes on the middle Rhine in 12 B.C., and were finally subdued by Tiberius, who had taken the command vacated by the death of Drusus, in 9 B.C. They were *partim excisi, partim in Galliam traiecti.* Suetonius (*Aug.* 21) says: *Suebos et Sigambros dedentis se traduxit in Galliam atque in proximis Rheno agris conlocavit.* It may have been at this point that Maelo became the suppliant of Augustus. The Marcomanni also who, like the Quadi, seem to have been included under the generic name of Scubi, were dislodged by the campaigns of Drusus, and migrated to the upper Elbe, where they formed the powerful kingdom of Maroboduus. The name of their fugitive king cannot be recovered.

VI. 3–6. *Ad me rex Parthorum Phrates Orodis filius filios suos nepotesque omnes misit in Italiam, non bello superatus, sed amicitiam nostram per liberorum suorum pignora petens.*

17. 4–8. *Πρὸς ἐμὲ βασιλεὺς Πάρθων Φραάτης Ὠρώδου υἱὸς υἱοὺς αὑτοῦ υἱωνούς τε πάντας ἔπεμψεν εἰς Ἰταλίαν, οὐ πολέμῳ λειφθείς, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν φιλίαν ἀξιῶν ἐπὶ τέκνων ἐνεχύροις.*

Phraates moreover, son of Orodes, king of the Parthians, sent to me in Italy all his sons and grandsons, not being conquered in war, but seeking our friendship through the pledge of his children.

Tacitus (*Ann.* 2. 1) closely agrees with this account: *Nam Phraates, quamquam depulisset exercitus ducesque Romanos,*

cuncta venerantium officia ad Augustum verterat partemque prolis firmandae amicitiae miserat, haud perinde nostri metu quam fidei popularium diffisus. It appears from Strabo (p. 748) that four sons were sent with two wives and four grandsons, and that they were sent, partly as hostages, partly to remove them from domestic intrigues (cf. Vell. 2. 94 and Suet. *Aug.* 21 and 43). It is doubtful, however, whether Josephus (*Ant. Jud.* 18. 2, 4) does not give the real explanation, when he attributes it to the machinations of a concubine of Phraates, who wishing to secure the succession for her son Phreataces, πείθει αὐτὸν ἐκπέμπειν εἰς Ῥώμην ἐφ' ὁμηρείαν τοὺς γνησίους παῖδας. The date of this incident is often taken to be 20 B.C., and the surrender to have been part of the negotiations resulting in the restoration of the captured eagles. This is, however, nowhere directly stated, and is not easy to reconcile with the story of Josephus, since it implies an interval of eighteen years between the intrigue of the concubine and the actual succession of her son. Strabo too declares explicitly that the hostages were handed over to M. Titius, legate of Syria, and Mommsen shows good reason for placing his governorship between 11 and 8 B.C. Whenever it was taken, the step of Phraates furnished Augustus and his successors with a useful supply of Oriental princes from whom to send out pretenders to the Parthian or Armenian thrones.

VI. 6–8. *Plurimaque aliae gentes expertae sunt populi Romani fidem me principe, quibus antea cum populo Romano nullum extiterat legationum et amicitiae commercium.*

17. 8–11. Πλεῖστά τε ἄλλα ἔθνη πεῖραν ἔλαβεν δήμου Ῥωμαίων πίστεως ἐπ' ἐμοῦ ἡγεμόνος, οἷς τὸ πρὶν οὐδεμία ἦν πρὸς δῆμον Ῥωμαίων πρεσβειῶν καὶ φιλίας κοινωνία.

Under my principate numerous other races, with whom before that time there had existed no bond of diplomacy or

friendship, have made trial of the good faith of the Roman people.

This may well be true of remoter tribes in Britain or Germany or beyond the Danube or in the East, but, if this intercourse had had any real importance, Augustus would hardly have contented himself with so vague and general a statement.

CAP. XXXIII

VI. 9–12. *A me gentes Parthorum et Medorum per legatos principes earum gentium reges petitos acceperunt Parthi Vononem regis Phratis filium, regis Orodis nepotem; Medi Ariobarzanem regis Artavazdis filium, regis Ariobarzanis nepotem.*

17. 12–16. *Παρ' ἐμοῦ ἔθνη Πάρθων καὶ Μήδων διὰ πρέσβεων τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς πρώτων βασιλεῖς αἰτησάμενοι ἔλαβον Πάρθοι Οὐονώνην βασιλέως Φράτου υἱόν, βασιλέως Ὠρώδου υἱωνόν· Μῆδοι Ἀριοβαρζάνην βασιλέως Ἀρταβάζου υἱόν, βασιλέως Ἀριοβαρζάνου υἱωνόν.*

The races of the Parthians and Medes, sending as ambassadors nobles of their own race, sought and accepted kings at my hands, the Parthians Vonones son of king Phraates, grandson of king Orodes, the Medes Ariobarzanes son of king Artavasdes, grandson of king Ariobarzanes.

Suetonius (*Aug.* 21) says vaguely: *Parthi . . . pluribus quondam de regno concertantibus non nisi ab ipso electum probaverunt.* Tacitus (*Ann.* 2. 1) speaking of the disturbed state of the East under Tiberius traces back events in Parthia as the causes of present troubles: *initio apud Parthos orto, qui petitum Roma acceptumque regem, quamvis gentis Arsacidarum, ut externum aspernabantur. Is fuit Vonones, obses Augusto datus a Phraate.*

The course of events as well as their date may be gathered from Josephus (*Ant. Jud.* 18. 2. 4). After what appears to have been the expulsion of Phreataces and the brief reign of Orodes, the romanizing party in Parthia sent an embassy to Augustus, begging him to restore Vonones, the eldest surviving son of Phraates, to his ancestral kingdom. If the embassy is that mentioned by Suetonius (*Tib.* 16) as having been sent on by Augustus to Tiberius in his province, the most probable date is between A.D. 4 and 6, while Tiberius was in Germany. This agrees with the account of Josephus, and the evidence afforded by the Parthian coins as examined by Prof. Gardner (*The Coinage of Parthia*). For some time Vonones maintained his position against his rival Artabanus, whom he even defeated and drove out. But in spite of his birth, he seems never to have won the sympathy of the Parthian people, and as no coin of his is known after A.D. 10, it was probably in that year that Artabanus finally expelled him. He then transferred himself to Armenia, where for some years he was the recognized or half-recognized client king of that Protectorate. The failure of a Parthian prince brought up in Rome to adapt himself to Oriental conditions was again illustrated in the case of Tiridates sent out by Tiberius, and of Meherdates sent out by Claudius.

As to Media Atropatene, its affairs have been alluded to above in connexion with those of Armenia. It will be remembered that after the flight of its king Artavasdes and his installation as king of Armenia Minor, Media was allowed to remain for some years under Artaxias of Armenia. This state of things ended with his death in 20 B.C., and it was no doubt at that time that Ariobarzanes, who had lived in Rome, was sent out and restored to his father's ancestral kingdom by Tiberius. Augustus is only recording here the dispatch of kings to races outside the empire, so that the fact that kings were set up in a country like Armenia would not be relevant.

CAP. XXXIV

VI. 13–16. *In consulatu sexto et septimo, bella ubi civilia exstinxeram per consensum universorum potitus rerum omnium, rem publicam ex mea potestate in senatus populique Romani arbitrium transtuli.*

17. 17–22. *Ἐν ὑπατείᾳ ἕκτῃ καὶ ἑβδόμῃ μετὰ τὸ τοὺς ἐνφυλίους ζβέσαι με πολέμους κατὰ τὰς εὐχὰς τῶν ἐμῶν πολειτῶν ἐνκρατὴς γενόμενος πάντων τῶν πραγμάτων, ἐκ τῆς ἐμῆς ἐξουσίας εἰς τὴν τῆς συνκλήτου καὶ τοῦ δήμου τῶν Ῥωμαίων μετήνεγκα κυριήαν.*

In my sixth and seventh consulships, after I had extinguished the civil wars, having been put in supreme possession of the whole empire by the universal consent of all, I transferred the republic from my own power into the free control of the senate and Roman people.

It is clear from the phrases *potitus rerum omnium* and *ex mea potestate* that up to his sixth and seventh consulships (28 and 27 B. C.) Octavian was in some way the supreme ruler of the whole empire. That had been the position of Iulius Caesar till his death in virtue of the dictatorship, which, like that of Sulla, was ultimately based upon a law passed by the people. As supreme, and far more arbitrarily exercised, was the rule of the triumvirs, established by the *lex Titia* and, if the view taken above is correct, afterwards renewed for a second term of five years. That extraordinary powers were retained both by Octavian and Antony in the two years following the expiry of this second term, we have already seen, though the words of Augustus, *συνέχεσιν ἔτεσι δέκα*, conceal this fact. But when actual war broke out in 31 B. C., we must of necessity regard the triumvirate as definitely at an end. It was clearly at this point that Octavian became *per consensum universorum potitus rerum omnium*. That it was

a position emanating from the action of the senate is of course impossible. The word *universorum* precludes this, and it in no way corresponds with the situation of the senate at the time. Nor could the passing of a law by the people have been expressed by so loose a phrase as *universorum consensus*. At the same time, the phrase seems more definite than that in the Greek version, κατὰ τὰς εὐχὰς τῶν ἐμῶν πολιτῶν, which Mommsen seems inclined to follow. The most reasonable view seems to be that Octavian chose to interpret the universal oath of military allegiance which, as he says, was taken to himself by Italy and all the Western provinces (V. 3), as in effect an informal but unmistakable mandate to take over the supreme control of the empire. His position, therefore, was that of Iulius Caesar over again, but without the title of dictator, and based not on any legal enactment, but on the universal recognition of a supreme crisis. It was the collective powers of the now extinct triumvirate thrust into the hands of the man who alone could save the Roman state from disruption or Oriental despotism.

In this position of supreme, unquestioned, but constitutionally *de facto* authority Octavian remained throughout 30 and 29 B.C., annexing and settling the government of Egypt, making provisional arrangements for the defence of the Eastern frontier, reorganizing several of the Oriental provinces, disbanding and colonizing soldiers, and carrying on the government in Rome and Italy. But he had no intention of perpetuating this abnormal régime which, as he knew well, had cost his adoptive father his life. Ever since his position in the West was defined by the treaty of Brundisium and secured by the disappearance of Sex. Pompeius, he had been feeling his way towards a more regular state of things, and had more than once promised to restore τὴν ἐντελῆ πολιτείαν. It was this promise which he proceeded to redeem in his sixth and seventh consulships. If the restoration of the republic meant a return to that system of government which

had existed before the civil war, it clearly could not be achieved by any single act. The working of the 'republic' had depended upon the action and interaction of people, senate, and executive, and this action and interaction were not limited to Rome or even Italy, but had to be regulated for an empire extending from the Atlantic to the Euphrates. Any restoration, therefore, would have to be made step by step and piece by piece. The electoral system had practically ceased to exist; some magistrates, like censors, were never appointed at all; others found their functions curtailed; all were stripped of prestige. Legislation was dormant, the finances under no constitutional control, and the effects of many reckless acts of the triumvirate were an obstacle to orderly government. In the sixth consulship several important steps were taken. We have already seen that in this year the first census since 70 B. C. was completed, censorial powers having in the previous year been put into the hands of Octavian and Agrippa, possibly by means of a law. Closely connected with this, and an essential preliminary to the new and constitutional régime, was the drastic *lectio senatus*, by which it was intended to fit the senate to resume its role as a governing body. In this aspect it was not without significance that Octavian was enrolled at the head of the revised list as *princeps senatus*. καὶ τὰς ἀπογραφὰς ἐξετέλεσε, καὶ ἐν αὐταῖς πρόκριτος τῆς γερουσίας ἐπεκλήθη, ὥσπερ ἐν τῇ ἀκριβεῖ δημοκρατίᾳ ἐνενόμιστο (Dio Cass. 53. 1). Whether it was in the same year that Augustus restored the popular right of election (*comitiorum pristinum ius reduxit*), and allowed the higher magistrates to discharge their proper functions (*imperium magistratuum ad pristinum redactum modum*), is not certain. The fact, however, is stated by Appian (*B. C.* 5. 132) πολλὰ τῆς πολιτείας ἐφίει τοῖς ἐτησίοις ἄρχουσι διοικεῖν κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, and Dio mentions that in 28 B. C. Octavian shared the *fasces* month by month with Agrippa his colleague in the consulship (loc. cit.). It was certainly beginning to be true from this time that *sua praetoribus sua consulibus*

species, minorum quoque magistratuum exercita potestas. We may probably add to the acts of 28 B.C. the arrangement by which the *aerarium Saturni* was entrusted to senatorial *praefecti*, elected by and responsible to that body (Tac. *Ann.* 13. 29). All these things and others like them were instances of transferring the republic to the senate or people, at least as far as αἱ ἀρχαὶ καὶ τὰ χρήματα were concerned (Dio Cass. 52. 13). Another step taken in the sixth consulship which, though uncertain in its exact scope, was clearly intended to mark the close of arbitrary rule, was the cancelling by edict of the illegal and unjust acts of the triumvirate. πάντα αὐτὰ δι' ἑνὸς προγράμματος κατέλυσεν, ὅρον τὴν ἕκτην αὐτοῦ ὑπατείαν προσθείς (Dio Cass. 53. 2). Similarly Tacitus declares: *sexto demum consulatu Caesar Augustus potentiae securus quae triumviratu iusserat abolevit, deditque iura quis pace et principe uteremur* (*Ann.* 3. 28). That certain acts of injustice were undone by this edict is probable, but the wholesale cancelling of *acta* was always dangerous, and the act was perhaps more a manifesto of prospective importance than a really retrospective edict of atonement. The concluding statement of Tacitus is perhaps more true to the facts than the claim of Augustus: 'he established a system of political rights the characteristic features of which were domestic peace and a *princeps*'.

But no restoration of republican forms had much meaning as long as Octavian was absolute master, as Caesar and the triumvirs had been, of the whole extra-Italian empire and its armed forces. The transference of these powers to senate and people, whether likely to be beneficial or the reverse, would indeed be a restoration of the free republic. It was this final step which Augustus claims to have taken in the January of his seventh consulship. Dio Cassius (53. 3 foll.) puts into the mouth of Augustus a speech delivered to the senate at the beginning of 27 B.C. We need not, of course, accept the speech as authentic, nor approve without qualification Dio's view that the whole motive of Octavian was to

retain the monarchy with general consent. But at least the statements attributed to Octavian must correspond with the account of Dio's authorities and, though with more detail, to the assertion of Augustus himself. I will cite three passages: *ἀλλὰ ἀφίημι τὴν ἀρχὴν ἅπασαν καὶ ἀποδίδωμι ὑμῖν πάντα ἁπλῶς, τὰ ὅπλα τοὺς νόμους τὰ ἔθνη, οὐχ ὅπως ἐκεῖνα ὅσα μοι ὑμεῖς ἐπετρέψατε, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅσα αὐτὸς μετὰ ταῦθ' ὑμῖν προσεκτησάμην* (c. 4), *κομίσασθε καὶ τὰ ὅπλα καὶ τὰ ἔθνη τὰ ὑπήκοα καὶ πολιτεύεσθε ὥσπερ εἰώθειτε* (c. 5), *ὑμῖν γὰρ, ὑμῖν τοῖς ἀρίστοις καὶ φρονιμωτάτοις πάντα τὰ κοινὰ ἀνατίθημι* (c. 8).

We may with some confidence assume that Octavian did, at any rate for the moment, resign the provinces and the armies of the empire into the hands of the senate, which, apart from extraordinary laws always looked upon by strict constitutionalists as an encroachment on its functions, had under the republic disposed of provinces and armies. If so, he had stripped himself of all his extraordinary powers, and retained only the consulship, which he had held every year since 31, and no doubt intended to hold each year, and the life-long *tribunicia potestas*, which had a Caesarian, though not a republican, precedent, and which had not so far been used for administrative purposes. It is of course conceivable that, as far as domestic matters were concerned, this restored rule of senate and people, with a permanent consul and potentially a permanent tribune, might have worked no worse, but hardly better than before. It was the stage, brief and unreal, as we shall see, in which Tacitus (*Ann.* 1. 2) represents Augustus as *consulem se ferens et ad tuendam plebem tribunicio iure contentum*. But such a return to the *status quo ante* would have left the problems of imperial government and foreign policy as unsatisfactorily met, and the situation as much exposed to civil war as in the whole of the post-Sullan period.

For what followed the resignation in Jan. 27 B.C. of all the provinces and armies, we may turn to Dio Cassius (53. 11 foll.). In c. 11, after describing the different feelings

with which the declaration of Augustus was received in the senate, Dio declares, *κατηνάγκασαν δῆθεν αὐτὸν αὐταρχῆσαι*, and in the next chapter repeats, *τὴν μὲν οὖν ἡγεμονίαν τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ καὶ παρὰ τῆς γερουσίας τοῦ τε δήμου ἐβεβαιώσατο*. This, according to Dio's interpretation, was precisely what Augustus was aiming at, the complete restoration by the senate[1] of all the provinces and all the armies. But, Dio proceeds, *βουληθεὶς δὴ καὶ ὡς δημοτικός τις εἶναι δόξαι, τὴν μὲν φροντίδα τήν τε προστασίαν τῶν κοινῶν πᾶσαν ὡς καὶ ἐπιμελείας τινὸς δεομένων ὑπεδέξατο*, and refusing to govern all the provinces, or any of them indefinitely, he assigned the weaker and more peaceful provinces to the senate, and retained himself those that were exposed to external attack and needed protection.

As to the statement that Augustus definitely undertook *τὴν φροντίδα τήν τε προστασίαν τῶν κοινῶν*, it can only mean, like a somewhat similar statement of Strabo (*ἡ πατρὶς αὐτῷ ἐπέτρεψεν τὴν προστασίαν τῆς ἡγεμονίας*, p. 840), that his general position as *princeps* amounted to this. As to the provinces, the most probable view is that Augustus restored them all to the senate which, as it had done under the republic, sent out ex-praetors or ex-consuls to govern them for a year as proconsuls, their *imperium* being an *imperium proconsulare*. But, in accordance no doubt with an understanding arrived at before the restoration, the senate treated a certain number of provinces in a different way, and instead of entrusting them for a year to separate proconsuls, each with *imperium proconsulare*, it assigned them collectively to Caesar for ten years (Dio. Cass. 53. 13), not as proconsul of all or any of them, but with the powers of a proconsul (*imperium proconsulare*), and the right of delegating the actual government of each to a *legatus*, just as Pompey had done after 54 B.C. in the case of his Spanish provinces. These

[1] Dio says *παρὰ τῆς γερουσίας τοῦ τε δήμου*, but in his own day the phrase *senatus populusque Romanus* was the official description of the senate, and there is really no room in Dio's account for any action by the people.

provinces were called the *provinciae Caesaris*, and, as they contained all the legions except two or three in Illyricum and one in Africa, Augustus had virtually the military forces of the empire at his command for ten years. Augustus might of course claim, as his own words, the language of court poets like Ovid, and legends on coins and medals prove that he did, that his acts taken collectively were equivalent to a restoration of republican government. The administrative machinery was all to be carried on under republican forms (*eadem magistratuum vocabula*); for even the *provinciae Caesaris* were conferred by the senate, and after ten years would revert to the senate, unless the grant was renewed, and that this provincial and military authority should emanate from the senate rather than from the people by an exaggeration of the Gabinian or Vatinian laws, was in accordance with strict constitutional views since Sulla. The free republic had been under a government by senate and people, but the constitution had been so flexible and elastic as to admit of either a democratic republic with certain precarious rights reserved for the senate, or an oligarchical republic directed by the senate, but liable to occasional interventions, amounting even to revolution, by tribunes and people. The difficulty sometimes felt in admitting that Augustus restored the republic will disappear, if we remember that it was an aristocratic and not a democratic republic which re-emerged in 28 and 27 B. C. The senate, aided by and directing the republican magistrates, was to have an important part to play in the administration of both domestic and foreign affairs. The people received back its formal rights of legislation and election, but had lost all power of political initiative. The official version, as stated by Velleius (2. 89), was true in the letter: *sepulta externa, revocata pax . . . restituta vis legibus, iudiciis auctoritas, senatui maiestas, imperium magistratuum ad pristinum redactum modum, . . . prisca illa et antiqua reipublicae forma revocata.*

On the other hand, Dio Cassius (ἐκ τούτου μοναρχεῖσθαι αὖθις

ἀκριβῶς ἤρξαντο, 52. 1), Suetonius (*de reddenda republica bis cogitavit, . . . sed . . . in retinenda perseveravit, Aug.* 28), and Tacitus (*deditque iura quis pace et principe uteremur, Ann.* 3. 28) are not speaking without justification. For the *potestas* of the one man from which he claimed to be transferring the republic was far indeed from being extinct. He was not king or dictator, but merely the first citizen in the restored republic, the *princeps civitatis*, and yet for the next ten years he was to have under his own control the whole of Gaul, practically the whole of Spain, and in the East Syria and Egypt. This position gave him the control of the Roman armies, if indeed that was not involved in his title of *imperator*.[1] When we add the fact, established by Strabo (loc. cit.) that πολέμου καὶ εἰρήνης κατέστη κύριος διὰ βίου, we can estimate with some precision the degree in which the free republic was restored, and the *potestas* of the one man eliminated. Dio is wrong in calling the government μοναρχία, for Augustus possessed no title and held no powers which might not be brought under the scheme of a republican constitution. Mommsen is surely not correct in calling it a dyarchy, for it was a triple control, shared at least in theory by senate, people, and *princeps civitatis*. The last-named had emerged, so far as his constitutional status was concerned, out of certain acts taken by senate and people, but those acts were dictated by conditions which they were incapable of controlling, and which inevitably made the third or one-man factor in the *respublica* as independent and supreme as he might deem it advisable to become.

VI. 16–21. *Quo pro merito meo senatus consulto Aug. appellatus sum et laureis postes aedium mearum vestiti publice coronaque civica super ianuam meam fixa est clupeusque aureus in curia Iulia positus, quem mihi*

[1] The position of Augustus with regard to the armies in Illyricum and Africa between 27 and 23 B.C. is uncertain, but when in the latter year he had the *maius imperium* throughout the empire, any difficulty on this point would, I imagine, be removed.

senatum populumque Romanum dare virtutis clementiae iustitiae pietatis caussa testatum est per eius clupei inscriptionem.

17. 22–24—18. 1–6. *Ἐξ ἧς αἰτίας δόγματι συνκλήτου Σεβαστὸς προσηγορεύθην καὶ δάφναις δημοσίᾳ τὰ πρόπυλά μου ἐστέφθη, ὅ τε δρύινος στέφανος ὁ διδόμενος ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τῶν πολειτῶν ὑπεράνω τοῦ πυλῶνος τῆς ἐμῆς οἰκίας ἀνετέθη, ὅπλον τε χρυσοῦν ἐν τῷ βουλευτηρίῳ ἀνατεθὲν ὑπό τε τῆς συνκλήτου καὶ τοῦ δήμου τῶν Ῥωμαίων διὰ τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς ἀρετὴν καὶ ἐπείκειαν καὶ δικαιοσύνην καὶ εὐσέβειαν ἐμοὶ μαρτυρεῖ.*

For the which service I received the appellation of Augustus by decree of the senate, and the door-posts of my house were publicly decked with laurel leaves; the civic crown was fixed up above my gate, and a golden shield set up in the Julian senate-house, which, as its inscription testifies, was granted to me by the senate and Roman people to commemorate my virtue, clemency, justice, and piety.

Augustus seems to have regarded his mission as that of a second Romulus, and since to assume a name with so monarchical a ring was impossible, he found 'Augustus' with its sacred and dignified connotation exactly suited to his purpose. It was on 16 Jan. that the senate decreed the new title. Dio (53. 16) says: *ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ τῷ ἔργῳ αὐτὰ ἐπετέλεσεν, οὕτω δὴ καὶ τὸ τοῦ Αὐγούστου ὄνομα καὶ παρὰ τῆς βουλῆς καὶ παρὰ τοῦ δήμου ἐπέθετο.* He was called by this title, Dio explains, *ὡς πλεῖόν τι ἢ κατὰ ἀνθρώπους ὤν.* It conferred no fresh power, but it signified *τὴν τοῦ ἀξιώματος λαμπρότητα* (c. 18). Conf. Suet. *Aug.* 7; Vell. 2. 91; Liv. *Epit.* 134.

The laurel wreaths were a sign of victory, the civic crown of oak leaves had always been given for saving the lives of citizens. (It is curious that the Greek version goes out of its way

to explain this.) Dio (53. 16) states the fact of the decree and its significance: *καὶ γὰρ τό τε τὰς δάφνας πρὸ τῶν βασιλείων αὐτοῦ προτίθεσθαι, καὶ τὸ τὸν στέφανον τὸν δρύινον ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἁρτᾶσθαι, τότε οἱ ὡς καὶ ἀεὶ τούς τε πολεμίους νικῶντι καὶ τοὺς πολίτας σώζοντι ἐψηφίσθη.* Mommsen points to coins with *cos. VII* and *civibus servatis*, while others have the representation of a crown and oak leaves with the words, *ob cives servatos*. Augustus has already himself recorded the fact of his conquests by sea and land after the civil wars (see above I. 13 ff.), and of his having spared all surviving citizens. Such a statement may well have been made by Augustus in the senate in Jan. 27 B.C., and have been followed by the honours here commemorated. That the civic crown was to mark some widely felt service to the empire is indicated by the words of Pliny (*H. N.* 16. 3. 8): *Augustus civicam coronam a genere humano accepit.*

The dedication of the *clupeus* and its inscription are confirmed by *C. I. L.* ix. 5809 *senatus populusque Romanus Augusto dedit clupeum virtutis clementiae iustitiae pietatis causa.*

VI. 21–23. *Post id tempus praestiti omnibus dignitate, potestatis autem nihilo amplius habui quam qui fuerunt mihi quoque in magistratu conlegae.*

18. 6–8. *Ἀξιώματι πάντων διήνεγκα, ἐξουσίας δὲ οὐδέν τι πλεῖον ἔσχον τῶν συναρξάντων μοι.*

After that time I stood before all others in dignity, but of actual power I possessed no more than my colleagues in each several magistracy.

The second part of this statement may be true in the letter as far as it goes, but on examination it goes a very little way, and if taken to describe the general position of Augustus within the state, it is in the highest degree misleading. This will be clear if we remember that Augustus makes this assertion only in connexion with magistracies held by himself of

a collegiate character. But, strictly speaking, there was only one such magistracy, viz. the consulship, and even this was held regularly only up to 23 B.C., or four years *post id tempus*. There is, however, no objection to applying the assertion to the *tribunicia potestas*, which, though not properly a magistracy, did in a way make Augustus a colleague of the tribunes. It is, of course, true that the colleagues of Augustus in the consulship possessed, as he did himself, the *consularis potestas*, and that the tribunes still retained the *ius agendi cum plebe*, the *ius intercessionis*, and all the other tribunician rights. The real point was not possession of the rights, but freedom to use them, and judged by this test, both consuls and tribunes were *umbrae sine re*. What consul would unbidden use his right of calling the senate, or of issuing edicts, or even of nominating candidates at elections, or what tribune would venture to propose a law to the *comitia*? After 23 B.C. Augustus cut himself adrift from any regular magistracy, and the real bases of his power stood wholly outside the collegiate system. As a matter of fact, the various elements which made up the position of *princeps* made him not only first in dignity, but master of the empire.

CAP. XXXV

VI. 24–27. *Tertium decimum consulatum cum gerebam, senatus et equester ordo populusque Romanus universus appellavit me patrem patriae, idque in vestibulo aedium mearum inscribendum esse et in curia et in foro Augusto sub quadrigis, quae mihi ex s. c. positae sunt, decrevit.*

18. 9–15. Τρισκαιδεκάτην ὑπατείαν ἄγοντός μου ἥ τε σύνκλητος καὶ τὸ ἱππικὸν τάγμα ὅ τε σύνπας δῆμος τῶν Ῥωμαίων προσηγόρευσέ με πατέρα πατρίδος καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ προπύλου τῆς οἰκίας μου καὶ ἐν τῷ βουλευτηρίῳ

καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ τῇ Σεβαστῇ ὑπὸ τῷ ἅρματι, ὅ μοι δόγματι συνκλήτου ἀνετέθη, ἐπιγραφῆναι ἐψηφίσατο.

While I was holding my thirteenth consulship, the senate and equestrian order and the whole Roman people gave me the title of father of my country, and decreed that the title should be inscribed in the vestibule of my house and in the senate-house and in the forum of Augustus, under the chariot which was set up in my honour by decree of the senate.

The date on which the title of *pater patriae* was given is known from Ovid (*Fast.* 2. 119) and from the *Fasti Praenestini* to have been 5 Feb. 2 B.C. Augustus assumed the thirteenth consulship in order to superintend the *deductio in forum* of Lucius Caesar, who was also saluted as *princeps iuventutis* by the equestrian order on the occasion. Ovid (*Fast.* 2. 128) confirms the part taken in the acclamation by the *equites*, though Suetonius (*Aug.* 58) mentions only senate and people. The title of *P. P.* takes its place in the imperial nomenclature after that of *P. M.* (*pontifex maximus*).

VI. 27–28. *Cum scripsi haec, annum agebam septuagensumum sextum.*

18. 15–16. Ὅτε ἔγραφον ταῦτα, ἦγον ἔτος ἑβδομηκοστὸν ἕκτον.

At the time when I wrote these records, I was in my seventy-sixth year.

Augustus began his seventy-sixth year on 23 Sept. A.D. 13. In II. 9 above he declares that he took a third *lustrum*, and this, according to Suetonius (*Aug.* 97) and Dio Cassius (56. 29) was completed one hundred days before his death, i. e. on 11 May A.D. 14. The statement in I. 30 above that he was holding his thirty-seventh *tribunicia potestas* carries us a little farther, since that commenced on 27 June A.D. 14. The record was therefore drawn up between 27 June and his death on 19 Aug.,

and as he deposited the document in the *Atrium Vestae* (Suet. *Aug.* 101), it was probably before his last journey to Campania.

APP. I

VI. 29–30. *Summa pecuniae, quam dedit in aerarium vel plebei Romanae vel dimissis militibus: denarium sexiens milliens.*

18. 17–19. Συνκεφαλαίωσις ἠριθμημένου χρήματος εἰς τὸ αἰράριον ἢ εἰς τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ῥωμαίων ἢ εἰς τοὺς ἀπολελυμένους στρατιώτας, ἓξ μυριάδες μυριάδων.

The total amount of money given to the aerarium or to the Roman plebs or to discharged soldiers was six hundred million denarii.

With this statement commences a brief appendix containing an imperfect *résumé* of two small sections of the Monument, relating to expenditure and buildings. It adds no new fact or item to the contents of the main document, except a reference to pecuniary subventions made to senators and assistance given to Italian or provincial cities in distress, points not strictly falling under the subject-matter of the record as defined by Augustus himself. Whether this appendix was added to the copy of the record set up at Apollonia in Pisidia, or formed a part of the original inscription outside the mausoleum of Augustus in Rome, we have no means of knowing. Mommsen believes, partly from the fact that even in the Latin version the money is calculated in *denarii* and not in *sesterces*, partly from the reference to provincial cities, that the author of the appendix was a provincial and a Greek, and that he was authorized to draw up this abstract either by the legate of Galatia who was entrusted with the inscription of the Monument at Ancyra, or by the municipal magistrates of that city. This hypothesis would of course be upset, if traces of the appendix should come to light elsewhere, and, though the verbs in the third person

show that the statement is not that of Augustus himself, it seems to me probable that it was added by his direction. I do not see how the reference to the innumerable sums spent on the relief of communities and individuals could have come from any other source, and, though there was no place for them in the body of the record, it is both intelligible and characteristic of Augustus that he should have had these few words inserted to save them from oblivion. The sum of 600,000,000 *denarii* or 2,400,000,000 *sesterces* is made up as follows:

75,000,000 $\overline{\text{HS}}$ given to the *plebs* in 44 B.C. (III. 7).
100,000,000 $\overline{\text{HS}}$ given to the *plebs* in 29 B.C. (III. 8).
100,000,000 $\overline{\text{HS}}$ given to the *plebs* in 24 B.C. (III. 9).
100,000,000 $\overline{\text{HS}}$ given to the *plebs* in 12 B.C. (III. 12).
76,800,000 $\overline{\text{HS}}$ given to the *plebs* in 5 B.C. (III. 19).
120,000,000 $\overline{\text{HS}}$ for military colonists in 29 B.C. (III. 17).
48,000,000 $\overline{\text{HS}}$ given to the *plebs* in 2 B.C. (III. 16).
600,000,000 $\overline{\text{HS}}$ for purchase of Italian land (III. 22).
260,000,000 $\overline{\text{HS}}$ for purchase of provincial land (III. 25).
400,000,000 $\overline{\text{HS}}$ paid to discharged soldiers from 7 to 2 B.C. (III. 28).
150,000,000 $\overline{\text{HS}}$ to subsidize *aerarium* (III. 34).
170,000,000 $\overline{\text{HS}}$ to endow the *aerarium militare* in A.D. 6 (III. 35).

The total which these items make up is two thousand one hundred and ninety-nine million eight hundred thousand *sesterces* (2,199,800,000 $\overline{\text{HS}}$), 200,000,000 $\overline{\text{HS}}$ or 50,000,000 *denarii* short of the sum stated, but sufficiently near perhaps as a round number.

APP. II

VI. 31–36. *Opera fecit nova aedem Martis, Iovis Tonantis et Feretri, Apollinis, divi Iuli, Quirini, Minervae, Iunonis Reginae, Iovis Libertatis, Larum, Deum Penatium, Iuventatis, Matris Deum, Lupercal, pulvinar ad*

circum, curiam cum chalcidico, forum Augustum, basilicam Iuliam, theatrum Marcelli, porticus . . . nemus trans Tiberim Caesarum.

18. 20–24—19. 1–3. *Ἔργα καινὰ ἐγένετο ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ναοὶ μὲν Ἄρεως, Διὸς Βροντησίου καὶ Τροπαιοφόρου, Πανός, Ἀπόλλωνος, θεοῦ Ἰουλίου, Κυρείνου, Ἀθηνᾶς, Ἥρας βασιλίδος, Διὸς Ἐλευθερίου, ἡρώων, θεῶν πατρίων, Νεότητος, Μητρὸς θεῶν, βουλευτήριον σὺν χαλκιδικῷ, ἀγορᾷ Σεβαστῇ, θέατρον Μαρκέλλου, βασιλικὴ Ἰουλία, ἄλσος Καισάρων, στοαὶ ἐν Παλατίῳ, στοὰ ἐν ἱπποδρόμῳ Φλαμινίῳ.*

He completed the following new buildings: the temples of Mars, Iupiter Tonans and Iupiter Feretrius, Apollo, the deified Iulius, Quirinus, Minerva, Iuno Regina, Iupiter the Liberator, the Lares, the divine Penates, the goddess of Youth, the Mother of the gods, the Lupercal, the shrine at the circus, the senate-house with adjoining chapel of Minerva, the Forum of Augustus, the basilica Iulia, the theatre of Marcellus, the porticoes . . . the grove of the Caesars beyond the Tiber.

The slight differences of order between the Latin and the Greek are of no significance. The latter puts the Lupercal (temple of Pan) higher in the list, and relegates the *pulvinar ad circum* to the end.

APP. III

VI. 37–38. *Refecit Capitolium sacrasque aedes numero octoginta duas, theatrum Pompei, aquarum rivos, viam Flaminiam.*

19. 3–5. *Ἐπεσκευάσθη τὸ Καπιτώλιον, ναοὶ ὀγδοήκοντα δύο, θέατρον Πομπηίου, ὁδὸς Φλαμινία, ἀγωγοὶ ὑδάτων.*

He restored the Capitol, eighty-two temples of the gods,

the theatre of Pompey, the channels of the aqueducts, and the Via Flaminia.

APP. IV

VI. 39–43. *Impensa p . . . . . in spectacula scaenica et munera gladiatorum atque athletas et venationes et naumachiam, et donata pecunia a . . . . . terrae motu incendioque consumptis aut viritim amicis senatoribusque, quorum census explevit, innumerabilis.*

19. 5–11. Δαπάναι δὲ εἰς θέας καὶ μονομάχους καὶ ἀθλητὰς καὶ ναυμαχίαν καὶ θηρομαχίαν δωρεαί τε ἀποικίαις πόλεσιν ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ, πόλεσιν ἐν ἐπαρχείαις σεισμῷ καὶ ἐνπυρισμοῖς πεπονηκυίαις ἢ κατ' ἄνδρα φίλοις καὶ συνκλητικοῖς ὧν τὰς τειμήσεις προσεξεπλήρωσεν: ἄπειρον πλῆθος.

As to the money spent on theatrical exhibitions and gladiatorial shows and athletic contests and the baiting of wild beasts and the naval battle, and donations made to cities in Italy and the provinces when overwhelmed by earthquake or fire, or individual subventions to friends or to senators whose property he made up to the full requirement, the amount expended is incalculable.

As already pointed out, the last part of this statement is independent of the Monument itself; it confirms statements made by Suetonius and Dio Cassius. Thus the former tells us: *urbium [in provinciis] quasdam . . . aut aere alieno laborantis levavit aut terrae motu subversas denuo condidit* (*Aug.* 47); and *senatorum censum . . . supplevit non habentibus* (ib. 41); Dio (54. 23) says: Παφίοις τε σεισμῷ πονήσασι καὶ χρήματα ἐχαρίσατο . . . καὶ ἄλλαις πόλεσι πολλαῖς καὶ πρότερον καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Αὔγουστος ἐφ' ὁμοίαις συμφοραῖς καὶ οἱ βουλευταὶ ἐπεκούρησαν. As to senators cf. 53. 2 βουλευταῖς τισι χρήματα ἐχαρίσατο.

LIST OF ARTICLES SINCE 1908 ON POINTS OF ROMAN HISTORY

1. Some notable iudicia populi. *Journ. Rom. Stud.*, vol. iii, pp. 25–59.
2. Were the lex Thoria of 118 B. C. and the lex agraria of 111 B. C. reactionary? *J. Phil.*, vol. xxxi, No. 62, pp. 268–86.
3. Notes on the lex iudiciaria of G. Gracchus, the lex iudiciaria of Caepio, and the lex Thoria. *J. Phil.* vol. xxxii, No. 63, pp. 96–106.
4. Three questions as to Livius Drusus. *Class. Rev.*, vol. xxvii, No. 8, pp. 261–63.
5. The Transpadane question and the Alien Act of 65 or 64 B. C. *J. R. S.*, vol. vi, pp. 63–82.
6. The policy of the Rullan proposal in 63 B. C. *J. Phil.*, vol. xxxii, No. 64, pp. 228–60.
7. The political and legal aspects of the trial of Rabirius. *J. Phil.*, vol. xxxiv, No. 67, pp. 12–39.
8. The Catilinarian conspiracy in its context. *J. R. S.*, vol. vii, pp. 153–228.
9. The Transpadani and the colony of Novum Comum. *J. Phil.*, vol. xxxiii, No. 65, pp. 103–27.
10. Consular Provinces between 67 and 52 B. C. *Class. Rev.*, vol. xxxi, No. 1, pp. 11–15.
11. The evidence as to Caesar's position in Gaul. *J. Phil.*, vol. xxxiv, No. 68, pp. 161–221.
12. The Table of Heraclea and the lex Iulia municipalis. *J. R. S.*, vol. iv, pp. 65–110.
13. On the lex Iulia municipalis; a reply to Prof. Reid. *J. Phil.*, vol. xxxv, No. 69, pp. 19–50.
14. The professiones of the Heraclean Table; a reply to Prof. Elmore. *Class. Quart.*, vol. xi, No. 1, pp. 27–37.
15. Prof. Elmore's hypotheses. *Class. Quart.*, vol. xiii, No. 1, pp. 49–51.
16. The Table of Veleia or the lex Rubria. *English Historical Review*, vol. xxxi, No. 123, pp. 353–79.
17. The Speech of Claudius on the adlection of Gallic Senators. *J. Phil.*, vol. xxxii, No. 63, pp. 79–95.
18. Claudius and the primores Galliae; a reply and re-statement. *Class. Quart.*, vol. viii, No. 4, pp. 282–88.
19. Tacitus as a military historian in the Histories. *J. Phil.*, vol. xxxi, No. 61, pp. 123–52.

PRINTED IN ENGLAND
AT THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Sir William Ramsey discovered
fragments of Rar Scroll at Fusidian Antioch
Excavations begun completed
around 1924.

DG 279 .A4 1923
Augustus,
The Monumentum ancyranum

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
3 9371 00253 2364